

**Open Report on behalf of Richard Wills
Executive Director for Communities**

Report to:	Planning and Regulation Committee
Date:	10 June 2013
Subject:	County Council Application – L/0110/13

Summary:

Planning permission is sought to construct a single carriageway bypass to the eastern side of Lincoln known as the Lincoln Eastern Bypass. The bypass would link the existing northern relief road at the junction of the A15/A158 (Wragby Road) to the A15 (Sleaford Road) with new junctions/bridge crossings at Hawthorn Road, Greetwell Road, Lincoln-Market Rasen Railway line, River Witham, Washingborough Road (B1190), Heighington Road and Lincoln Road (B1188).

Recommendation:

That conditional planning permission be granted.

Background

1. In April 2005 planning permission (ref: L/0170/04) was granted for a dual carriageway Lincoln Eastern Bypass (LEB) scheme extending from the Wragby Road (A15/A158) roundabout to the Sleaford Road (A15) south of Bracebridge Heath. However, in 2005 work began on identifying alternative route options for the proposed LEB in order to take into account the future growth and potential long-term urban expansion of Lincoln which had been identified in the East Midlands Regional Plan 2009. This work led to the subsequent submission of a planning application for a revised LEB scheme which proposed an alternative route for the bypass to that granted by permission L/0170/04.
2. In October 2010 planning permission (ref: L/0170/10) was granted for the revised LEB scheme which, like the 2005 scheme, was for a dual carriageway bypass. The northern section of the revised LEB route (i.e. between Wragby Road and Washingborough Road) was congruent with that of the scheme approved in 2005, however, the southern section of the route (i.e. between Washingborough Road and Sleaford Road) differed in its alignment in order to reflect proposed future development to the east of Lincoln.

3. In 2010 the Coalition Government's Spending Review meant that the dual carriageway LEB scheme granted by permission L/0170/10 was not taken forward to programme entry for funding. However, the Department for Transport (DfT), announced that funding would be available through the development pool process for schemes that looked to revise the total funding required from the DfT. In response to this, possible changes to the scope and engineering of the LEB were identified and assessed in order to develop a more cost effective solution whilst ensuring the wider aims and objectives of the scheme were still capable of being achieved. This assessment resulted in the development of a further revised scheme which now proposes to construct a single carriageway bypass along the same route as that approved in 2010. A full description of this revised bypass proposal is given in this report along with a summary of the planning application documentation, consideration of the relevant development plan policies and a summary of the comments received through consultation and publicity.

The Application

4. Planning permission is sought to construct a 7.5km long single carriageway relief road linking the existing northern relief road at the junction of the A15 and A158 (Wragby Road) in the north to the A15 (Sleaford Road) in the south. The proposed route of the Lincoln Eastern Bypass (LEB) would bisect the Districts of West Lindsey, Lincoln and North Kesteven and run through an area of predominately arable land situated to the east of the city of Lincoln and the villages of Canwick and Bracebridge Heath and west of the outlying villages of North Greetwell, Cherry Willingham, Washingborough and Branston.
5. The scheme will comprise of the following key features/elements:
 - Creation of six new junctions which include:
 - Wragby Road (A15/A158) Roundabout - a new fourth arm would be constructed off the existing roundabout providing access to/from the LEB;
 - Hawthorn Road Junction - the stopping up and construction of a turning head on the western side Hawthorn Road where meets the proposed LEB route. A new entry/exit junction to the LEB would be constructed on the eastern side of Hawthorn Road;
 - Greetwell Road (B1308) Roundabout - a new four arm roundabout would be constructed where the LEB route crosses Greetwell Road providing a link to/from the LEB;
 - Washingborough Road (B1190) Roundabout – a new four arm roundabout would be constructed where the LEB route crosses Washingborough Road (B1190) providing a link to/from the LEB;
 - Lincoln Road (B1188) Roundabout - a new four arm roundabout would be constructed where the LEB route crosses Lincoln Road (B1188) providing a link to/from the LEB;

- Sleaford Road (A15) Roundabout - a new four arm roundabout would be constructed where the LEB route meets Sleaford Road (A15) and the realigned Bloxholm Lane.
- Construction of new bridges/structures along the LEB route including:
 - new bridges to carry the proposed LEB over the River Witham and adjacent North and South Delph watercourses and the Lincoln to Market Rasen railway line;
 - new bridges to carry the LEB under the Lincoln to Spalding railway line and Heighington Road;
 - three pedestrian/cycleway bridges at Greetwell Road, South Delph and Bloxholm Lane;
 - a new pedestrian/cycleway underpass at Lincoln Road (B1188) which would allow passage for non-motorised users beneath the LEB.
- Street lighting would be provided at the roundabout/junctions with local roads and the whole section of the route between Greetwell Road (B1308) and Washingborough Road (B1190) would also be lit. The lighting would be of a modern design including cut-offs to reduce light spill with columns being approximately 12m in height;
- Provision of a comprehensive drainage system to remove surface water from the LEB carriageway. Three main drainage networks are proposed (Network A, B and C) comprising of a series of catchment/attenuation ponds constructed along the route of the LEB and would allow for the controlled discharge of waters into nearby watercourses including North Delph, Canwick Fen Drain and Branston Brook;
- A flood storage area (approx. capacity of 1,110m³) would be excavated to compensate for an equivalent area that would be lost as a result of the development. This volume would ensure that there is no net loss of floodplain capacity as a result of the scheme.
- Realignment and channel amendments to existing watercourses and field drains including Reepham Beck, Wragby Road Ditch, Greetwell Fields and Canwick Fen Drains;
- The stopping up and realignment of existing public rights of way which would be severed by the route of the LEB as well as the stopping up and permanent closure of through access along sections of Hawthorn Road and Greetwell Fields. Part of Bloxholm Lane would also be diverted and realigned to accommodate the proposed route of the LEB;
- Significant earthworks comprising of deep cuttings and creation of raised embankments to carry the alignment of the LEB carriageway;
- Areas of land adjacent to the LEB have also been identified as storage areas for topsoils excavated as part of the engineering works and as

temporary compound areas to house site offices, plant and machinery and materials used during the construction of the LEB;

- Provision of a 3m wide non-motorised user route (i.e. combined pedestrian/cycleway) along the western side of the LEB for the full length of its route;
- The LEB would have a speed limit of 60 miles per hour;
- Loss of the south-eastern edge of Greetwell Quarry SSSI and Greetwell Wood SNCI deciduous woodland habitat;
- Creation of compensatory habitat areas comprising of habitat ponds, grassland and tree and shrub planting;
- Construction of landscape/noise screening bunds along sections of the LEB. The heights of these bunds vary between 2.2m and 2.6m (relative to the carriageway) depending on their location;
- The construction period for the LEB is anticipated to be approximately 24 months once the works commence. The estimated year of opening would be 2017.
- Future proofing – the scheme incorporates a number of future-proofing design elements so that, if necessary, in the future the LEB could be upgraded to a dual carriageway in the most cost effective manner with minimum disruption. Examples of such elements include:
 - all roundabouts are larger than usual for a standard single carriageway design so as to allow the carriageway to be widened with minimum disruption;
 - the western arm of the Greetwell Road (B1308) roundabout has provision to accommodate and enable linkage with future improvement works proposed for Greetwell Road (B11308). Such improvement works are not subject of this proposal and so would be pursued as a separate development/scheme;
 - the Greetwell Road (B1308) and Bloxholm Lane footbridges have a longer span than required for the single carriageway design so as to accommodate any future widening to the LEB without the need to replace or rebuild the footbridges;
 - the Lincoln to Market Rasen railway underbridge has a wider verge so as to allow for future widening of the LEB;
 - Heighington Road overbridge has been designed to enable it to accommodate any future widened LEB carriageway below.
 - Lincoln to Spalding railway bridge contains a two span box structure to allow for and simplify any future widening of the carriageway under the bridge;
 - Lincoln Road subway would be built wider than required for a single carriageway to accommodate any future widening of the carriageway;

- the drainage scheme (including catchment ponds) have been designed to allow for future widening of the carriageway;
- the carriageway crossfalls are traditionally designed to have a 'crown' in the middle (i.e. each lane falls away from the centreline). In the case of this scheme, the carriageway is designed to fall to the outside edge of the road;
- the large cutting south of the Washingborough Road (B1190) roundabout has been designed so that any future widening could be completed with the proposed landtake.

Route Description

A15/A158 Wragby Road Roundabout to Greetwell Road

6. The route would commence at the existing Wragby Road (A15/A158) roundabout with a new fourth arm being constructed off the roundabout to provide access to and from the LEB. From here the LEB would pass southwards towards Hawthorn Road where it would sever the route of an existing public footpath (running north of Hawthorn Road) as well as Hawthorn Road itself. The public footpath would be permanently stopped up and access provided to the new footpath/cycleway which would be constructed along the western side of the LEB route. Where the LEB meets Hawthorn Road, on the western side of the LEB, the road would be permanently stopped up and a new turning head created. The layout and arrangement of the proposed turning head has been revised so as to not impact upon the public open space/playground which is situated to the east of the existing housing development. The open space/playground was secured as part of a S106 Planning Obligation associated with the housing development approved by WLDC in 1999 (permission ref: 99/P/0284) and is now owned and managed by Greetwell Parish Council.
7. On the eastern side of the LEB, a 'left in, left out' only junction with auxiliary diverge lane and tapered merging lane would be constructed providing access to and from the eastern length of Hawthorn Road. This revised junction arrangement is one of the principle changes between this scheme and the approved dual carriageway scheme (permission ref: L/0170/10) where it had been proposed to install a bridge to carry Hawthorn Road over the LEB route. Surface water catchment ponds would also be constructed in this area immediately south of Hawthorn Road.
8. From Hawthorn Road the route would continue southwards towards its junction with Greetwell Road. On the western side, landscape/noise bunds would be constructed alongside the LEB (approximately 2.2m high relative to carriageway). Within this section the LEB route would bisect the minor public highway Greetwell Fields which would also be stopped up and, on the northern side of the LEB, a new turning head constructed. The remainder of Greetwell Fields is then proposed to be re-designated as a public bridleway. On the eastern side of the LEB an area of compensatory habitat would be created comprising of a habitat pond with associated native tree/shrub planting and wildflower grassland.

9. From this point the LEB would continue south and sever the south-eastern corner of Greetwell Hollow Quarry (SSSI) prior to joining the proposed new four arm roundabout (with an external diameter of approximately 80m) which would be constructed linking the LEB and Greetwell Road (B1308). A footbridge over the LEB would be constructed on the northern side of the Greetwell Road roundabout providing access to and from the LEB footpath and the existing footpath route running alongside Greetwell Road. A second series of surface water catchment ponds would also be constructed close to the roundabout north of Greetwell Road.

Greetwell Road Roundabout to Washingborough Road Roundabout

10. From the Greetwell Road roundabout, the LEB would continue south towards the Lincoln to Market Rasen railway line. A new single span steel bridge carrying the LEB over the railway line would be constructed which would also accommodate an extra wide footpath/cycleway along its western edge (approx. 8.7m wide). This wider footpath/cycleway is one of the future-proofing elements designed into the scheme so as to allow for any future widening to the LEB without the need to replace or rebuild the bridge.
11. From the railway line the LEB would veer south-west towards the River Witham and the adjacent North and South Delph watercourses. Given the gradient of this section of the route, between the River Witham and Greetwell Road roundabout, a crawler lane would be constructed on the northbound carriageway. A series of surface water catchment ponds would be constructed on the eastern side of the LEB (north of the North Delph watercourse) and a five span bridge constructed to carry the LEB over the River Witham and its flood plain, the North and South Delph watercourses and existing Sustrans route. Another set of surface water catchment ponds would be constructed on the eastern side of the LEB (south of the South Delph watercourse) and on the western side of the LEB a flood compensation area and new footpath/cycleway and bridge would be provided to link to the Sustrans route which runs alongside the river.
12. The LEB would then pass under the Lincoln to Spalding railway line (which already runs along a raised embankment) and immediately to the south connect to a new four arm roundabout linking the LEB to Washingborough Road (B1190). Another set of surface water catchment ponds would also be constructed to the east of the roundabout in an area of land lying between the railway line and Washingborough Road (B1190).

Washingborough Road (B1190) to Lincoln Road (B1188)

13. From Washingborough Road the bypass would travel south while climbing in a deep cutting towards Heighington Road. Given the gradient of this section of the route, a crawler lane would be constructed on the southbound carriageway. The LEB would then pass underneath Heighington Road which would be carried over the bypass on a new single span steel bridge. The bridge has a clear span width of approximately 33m which would allow

for any future widening to the LEB without the need to replace or rebuild the bridge at a later date.

14. The LEB would then veer south-west towards its junction with Lincoln Road (B1188). On the western side of the LEB landscape/noise bunds would be constructed alongside the route (approximately 2.4m high relative to carriageway). As the LEB nears Lincoln Road (B1188) a new four arm roundabout would be constructed connecting the two routes. Just north of this roundabout a pedestrian/cycle underpass would be constructed allowing passage under the LEB. The underpass would have an extended length of approximately 28m to allow for any future widening to the LEB without the need to replace or rebuild the structure at a later date.

Lincoln Road (B1188) to Sleaford Road (A15)

15. From Lincoln Road (B1188) the route continues south-westwards towards Sleaford Road (A15). Immediately south of the Lincoln Road (B1188) roundabout, on the eastern side of the LEB, two surface water drainage ponds would be constructed. As the LEB travels south landscape/noise bunds would also be constructed alongside the LEB (approximately 2.6m high relative to carriageway).
16. The existing alignment of Bloxholm Lane would be severed by the LEB and a combined pedestrian/cycle path bridge provided at this point to link the two halves of Bloxholm Lane. A four arm roundabout junction would be formed where the LEB meets Sleaford Road (A15) and this would incorporate a new road linking back to the eastern arm of Bloxholm Lane.

Environmental Statement

17. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) which is considered to meet the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011.
18. The ES sets out the results/findings of the EIA, including proposals of a number of mitigation measures that would be implemented to prevent and/or minimise any adverse effects. These are set out under a series of separate chapters which are as summarised as follows:

Chapter 1 provides a general introduction and description of the scheme, the methodology and approach taken in preparing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and explains the format and structure of the ES and each of its chapters.

Chapter 2 explains the need for the scheme. This chapter states that the LEB is essential to the delivery of the local policy and strategy objectives and highlights the current transport related problems and issues within Lincoln and the role the LEB would make in addressing these problems.

This chapter explains that a lack of route choice has long been identified as a problem for north-south movements through the city and this has resulted in significant levels of traffic being channelled through the centre of Lincoln. Such traffic not only has a detrimental impact on the environment but also impacts negatively upon all users of the network, for example, by increasing journey times, reducing the efficiency and reliability of public transport services and reduces the attractiveness for people to walk and cycle within and around the city. With traffic levels forecast to grow in the future this could lead to increased problems and pressure on the highway network which in turn impacts upon the quality of life for local residents, acts as a constraint to the economy and reduces the attractiveness of the city for visitors and investors.

The LEB is stated as being an intrinsic part of the Lincolnshire Transport Strategy and therefore is fundamental in facilitating Lincoln's continued growth and economic development. The scheme would not only help to alleviate existing congestion problems by removing extraneous traffic from the city but also act as a catalyst for further development by providing the necessary infrastructure to facilitate and support future growth proposals in and around Lincoln (i.e. the proposed residential development to the east of Lincoln known as the North East and South East Quadrants).

Chapter 3 provides an overview of the alternative route corridors and subsequent route alignments that were considered for the LEB. This chapter explains that in 2007 five potential route corridors were identified and assessed as possible routes for the LEB (Stage 1 Assessment). From this assessment, three potential routes were identified based on two of the corridors identified during Stage 1 and these were known as Routes X, Y and Z. The three routes were comparatively assessed (Stage 2 Assessment) and Route Z was eventually identified as the preferred option with the planning permission granted in 2010 (ref: L/0170/10) reflecting this proposed route.

In 2010 the Coalition Government's Spending Review meant that the dual carriageway LEB was not taken forward to programme entry for funding. However, the Department for Transport (DfT) announced that funding would be available through the development pool process for schemes that looked to revise the total cost required from the DfT. As a result, a value engineering process was undertaken to look for opportunities to reduce the overall scheme cost of the LEB. This exercise looked to assess possible changes in scope and all potential value engineering options in order to develop the most cost effective solution. The exercise looked at changes to highway design, earthworks, structures, drainage, lighting, construction and environmental measures. It evaluated each option in relation to the impact on the overall scheme objectives, the wider aims of the Lincolnshire Transport Strategy, the value for money objectives and whether it was achievable. The following options were considered as part of this exercise:

- i. a partial dual carriageway;
- ii. removing the pedestrian/cycleway route along the LEB route;

- iii. reducing/removing lighting across the length of the route;
- iv. reducing the length of the route;
- v. reducing to a single carriageway with future-proofed structures;
- vi. reducing to a single carriageway within single carriageway structures.

With the exception of 'v' all options were discarded on the basis of feasibility, value for money or contribution to scheme objectives. Option 'v' was therefore taken forward as the revised LEB scheme and it is this scheme that is subject of this application.

Chapter 4 gives a general description of the topography, existing land-uses and site setting for the LEB, along with an overview description of the proposed route and summary of key features/aspects of the scheme along sections of the route.

Chapter 5 explains what pre-application consultation took place in preparing the EIA and in relation to the revised single carriageway scheme now being proposed. This chapter explains that a number of statutory consultation bodies have been approached and consulted in order to aid the preparation of the EIA in relation to this revised scheme. As the preferred route for the LEB had already been extensively consulted upon prior to the 2010 planning permission being granted, the DfT considered it appropriate that LCC should conduct a limited, but focused, exercise to ensure that the single carriageway scheme being proposed remained relevant to the development plans of local stakeholders and represented good use of limited funds. This chapter states that all letters received from contacted stakeholders were in support of the scheme and emphatically detailed why the LEB is of strategic importance to the area. It is added that there was particularly strong support from the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and local business groups who recognised the economic benefits of the scheme.

Chapter 6 sets out the scope of the EIA and identifies the topics/issues which have been identified as needing to be assessed as part of the EIA. This chapter confirms that the scope of the EIA is the same as that which was undertaken for the dual carriageway scheme granted permission in 2010. Where appropriate the EIA has also taken into account guidance set out in the Highways Agency's publication "Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)" which sets out the general principles for EIA on highway schemes. The topics assessed by the EIA are as follows:

- Drainage and Water Environment (including Flood Risk)
- Soils and Geology
- Landscape and Visual Impact
- Noise and Vibration
- Air Quality
- Cultural Heritage
- Nature Conservation
- Land Use, Community and Private Assets
- Effects on Travellers

- Interactions and Cumulative Impacts

Chapters 7-16 summarise the potentially significant effects arising from the development on each of the identified EIA topic areas/issues and identifies any mitigation measures considered necessary to avoid identified negative effects. Each chapter explains the scope of the assessment, the key legislation and planning policy considerations in relation to each topic area, a summary of the baseline data and studies taken into account, a prediction of the potential impacts of the development and details of any proposed mitigation measures and residual effects. A summary of each chapter is as follows:

Chapter 7: Drainage and Water Environment (including Flood Risk) – this chapter assesses the potential impacts of the proposed bypass on the water environment including surface waters, groundwater and floodplains. This chapter also summarised the findings of the Flood Risk Assessment.

Surface Waters – the principal watercourses from north to south along the LEB route comprise of the Reepham Beck, Wragby Road Ditch, Greetwell Fields Drain, North Delph, River Witham, South Delph, Canwick Fen Drain, Branston Brook Tributary and the Ashfield Beck. Most of these watercourses eventually drain into the River Witham and Delph system. In addition to the principal watercourses there is a network of small stream, drains and ditches throughout or within close proximity of the corridor including land drainage ditches within the River Witham and Delph system corridor.

During the construction/operation of the LEB there are a series of impacts, risks and pollutants that have the potential to affect surface waters which include (inter alia):

- pollution from sedimentation and suspended solids from site run-off water;
- pollution from leakages or spillages of fuel, oil or chemicals;
- contamination from cement and concrete which can affect the pH of watercourses;
- contaminants and pollutants such as fuels, oils, hydrocarbons, chemicals arising from spillages, leaks and traffic accidents;
- increased flood risk as a result of development within the floodplain , increased run-off rates and volumes from hardstanding areas and proposed watercourse channel modifications and realignments.

Mitigation measures to be adopted/incorporated as part of the LEB to reduce, manage and mitigate these impacts include (inter alia);

- temporary cut-off drains used uphill and downhill of working areas to prevent clean runoff entering and dirty water leaving working areas without appropriate treatment;
- vegetated buffer strips maintained adjacent to all watercourses and the re-establishment of any vegetation lost as soon as practicable. If

necessary, additional measures such as geotextile membranes, mulching, brushwood mattresses, etc used to protect soils before vegetation has re-established;

- the use and storage of any cement close to any watercourse or drain would be carefully monitored to minimise the risk of any material entering the water;
- appropriate storage of all oils, fuels and chemicals in designated compound areas;
- the use of cofferdams to prevent the migration of soils and sediments into watercourses. In particular these would be employed where the works involve the installation of bridge abutments and piers on the banks of watercourses or which involve bank stabilisation and protection works.
- the culverting of watercourses that bisect the proposed LEB route;
- construction of a dedicated surface water drainage scheme which would direct run-off from the LEB to a number of dedicated attenuation/catchment ponds. Surface waters would be discharged from these ponds at a rate restricted to a greenfield equivalent of 2l/s/ha into nearby water courses (e.g. North Delph, Canwick Fen Drain and a tributary of Branston Brook);
- a programme of water quality monitoring on the relevant watercourses, upstream and downstream of the working corridor would be implemented and agreed with the Environment Agency prior to any construction works commencing;
- watercourse diversion would be aligned and profiled to maintain hydraulic capacity and replicate existing channel gradients and cross sections;
- installation of shut-off valves on all drainage networks to restrict discharges in the event of accidental spillages arising from traffic accidents;

Groundwater – potential impacts on groundwater during both the construction and operation of the LEB are similar to those identified above in relation to surface waters (e.g. contamination from spills or leaks of fuel, oils and chemicals, etc). However, in addition to these there is also the potential for changes to occur in groundwater flows due to the interception of natural pathways and the creation of hardsurfacing which can present a barrier to rainwater reaching the underlying strata and thus prevent recharge of the underlying aquifers. The four road cuttings proposed as part of the scheme also have the potential to intersect the groundwater table resulting in dewatering effects such as changes to groundwater flows and levels in the surrounding area.

The ES acknowledges that the creation of the impermeable carriageway would result in the loss of groundwater recharge, however, as a single carriageway scheme, the total area created would be less than that approved as part of the dual carriageway scheme approved in 2010. Notwithstanding this, the ES considers that the impact of the revised LEB scheme on groundwaters would be of negligible magnitude, resulting in an impact significance of neutral.

Flood Risk – the majority of the LEB route lies within land designated as Flood Zone 1, however, the bypass also crosses the floodplain of the River Witham. The flood plain is considered to be of high importance.

Fluvial flooding is currently well managed in the River Witham catchment meaning there is a limited number of people and properties at flood risk. Existing defences within the area are of a good/fair condition and consist of earth embankments and upstream flood storage reservoirs. These systems provide protection against a flood event with a 1% chance occurring in any year (e.g. 1 in 100 year). The construction and operation of the LEB has the potential to be at risk of flooding from the existing watercourse systems as well as to give rise to flooding elsewhere (e.g. through increased surface water run-off). The ES and Flood Risk Assessment assess the potential impacts of the bypass on flood risk.

Peak water levels in the River Witham and South Delph are lower than the proposed road level and therefore would not be at risk of flood from these watercourses. Even during a 1 in 100 year flood event the deck of the bypass bridge would be significantly higher than the water level and thus would not constrict flow or be negatively impacted upon during such an event. Existing flood defences are already in place and should a breach occur floodwaters would flow out of the bank and reach the adjacent plains. Therefore the risk of embankment breach is the same as that as the existing conditions and therefore so long as these existing defences are protected during construction and operation of the LEB the residual flood risk is considered to be minimal.

In order to prevent flood risk happening elsewhere as a result of the LEB, a detailed road surface water drainage scheme has been designed which would manage surface waters derived from the bypass. The scheme has been designed so that there is no increase in flooding in a 1 in 100 year event plus a 30% increase in rainfall intensity to account for possible climate change events. The drainage scheme reduces the potential flood risk as it is a dedicated system and thus controls surface waters derived from the bypass catchment separately to those derived from the existing catchment. The LEB derived surface waters would be directed to a series of attenuation lagoons which would be developed along the route of the bypass. These lagoons would be interlinked and surface waters from these discharged at reduced and controlled rates into nearby water courses (e.g. North Delph, Canwick Fen Drain and a tributary of Branston Brook therefore helping to manage surface waters and reduce flood risk.

Watercourses that bisect the proposed route of the bypass would be culverted so as not to constrict the existing drainage systems. The culverts have been designed with a sufficient capacity to pass the 1 in 100 year design flood event with an additional 30% increase in design flow for possible climate changes events.

Finally, the development also includes proposals to create an area of flood storage to compensate an equivalent area that would be lost as a result of

the development. This area would be excavated in a plot of land immediately south of Canwick Fen Drain and have a capacity of around 1,110m³. This volume would ensure that there is no net loss of floodplain capacity as a result of the scheme.

Overall the assessment concludes that, with the inclusion of the proposed design and mitigation measures (outlined above), the impacts on the water quality, geomorphology, hydrology and flood risk of surface waters and on water quality, flows and levels of groundwaters would be no greater than 'slight' at specific locations and would be 'slight' overall.

Chapter 8: Soils and Geology – this chapter assesses the potential impacts of the scheme on the geology and underlying and surrounding soils (including made ground and potentially contaminated land). The assessment area focuses on land immediately adjacent to, or within the footprint of the proposed bypass route.

The ES confirms that there are known historical ironstone mining and limestone extraction works within the footprint of the proposed bypass (predominantly around the Greetwell Hollow Quarry (SSSI)). Whilst the majority of the land affected by the development is occupied by agricultural land and farms, the ES also states that there are historical records of two landfills being present in the footprint of the proposed route – i.e. Greetwell Hollow Quarry and an area north-east of the proposed junction with Washingborough Road – and to the west of the proposed Washingborough Road junction potential contaminants including heavy metals, oils and hydrocarbons could be present as a result of the nearby sewage treatment works and the (man-made) railway embankment. In terms of impacts on soils, the ES confirms that these would be inevitable during the construction operations and in the long term as a number of deep cuttings and embankments would be constructed as part of the development.

Potential impacts that could arise during the construction and operation of the scheme are identified as follows (inter alia):

- potential disturbance of contaminated land and mobilisation of residual pollutants that are already present in the ground but which are stable or inactive in their present condition;
- changes in existing surface and groundwater flows as a result of excavations and creation of embankments;
- creation of new pollution pathways as a result of excavation activities which may potential contamination of soils as a result of accidental spillages or leaks of fuels and oils from construction plant and machinery;
- loss of approximately 5% of the Greetwell Hollow SSSI and obscuring of around 18% of the total exposed geological outcrop;
- compaction and consolidation of soils through vehicular movements which may affect the drainage of surface and ground waters;
- potential landslips arising from the deep cuttings and reactivation of existing slips;

- deterioration of soil structures and creation of dust by on site construction activities.

The following mitigation measures would be adopted to minimise and reduce the risks/impacts on soils and geology that have identified above. These include the following measures:

- implementation of measures to control and minimise the amount of sedimentation/loss of soils through surface water run-off (these measures reflect those discussed in Chapter 7 regarding controlling surface waters);
- cutting slopes shall be engineered and designed to minimise the potential for instability (e.g. shallow slope angles may be adopted or where steeper slope angles are required then the use of soil nailing could be implemented);
- implementation of a series of measures to restrict and minimise the incidence of dust (as detailed in Chapter 11 regarding impacts on Air Quality);
- construction of an embankment within the Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI to provide improved access to the remaining exposed outcrops for educational study/inspection. Whilst this would not mitigate against the area lost by the development it would provide a positive benefit to those wishing to study the geological formations;
- further assessments and mitigation schemes to be identified and implemented in the event that contaminated land is encountered during the construction/earthworks. These would be secured and managed with the site contractors through a Construction and Environmental Management Plan and would ensure that any contaminated land is appropriately managed so as not to pose an unacceptable risk to identified receptors.

This chapter concludes that, apart from the impacts on Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI, no significant impacts on soils and geology are considered likely during the construction and operation phases of the proposed scheme. Although there would be a negative residual impact as a result of obscuring the exposed faces of part of the Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI, the proposed improvement to access to the remaining outcrops would provide a positive benefit.

Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual Impact – this chapter includes an analysis of the existing landscape character of the area, identifies the potential effects of the development both during the construction and operation of the LEB on the local landscape character and surrounding visual receptors and includes an assessment of their significance. The ES explains that the visual effect of the scheme has been assessed/evaluated for three distinct periods being: (i) those experienced during the construction period and winter; (ii) the year of opening taking into account any mitigation that would have immediate effect (e.g. slope gradients), and; (iii) summer period 15 years after the scheme opening when the proposed mitigation planting has would have become established.

A summary the principal physical impacts identified are as follows:

- construction of temporary haulage/construction routes for site traffic;
- introduction of heavy plant used for construction of the new road;
- temporary storage of spoil, prior to reuse or removal offsite;
- lifting equipment including the use of cranes associated with the installation of structures/bridges;
- visual clutter associated with temporary diversions/closure of roads
- introduction of new and widened roundabout junctions with the associated loss of vegetation adjacent to the road;
- loss of arable farmland to accommodate new carriageway;
- loss of hedgerow boundaries and vegetation and severance of existing field patterns;
- significant earthworks and changes in the topography to incorporate cuttings for the proposed route of the LEB and creation of large-scale embankments and landscape/noise bunds;
- loss of vegetation and elements of the exposed rock faces within Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI;
- introduction of elevated structures and bridges within the local landscape including bridges to carry the LEB carriageway as well as cycleway/footpath bridges;
- introduction of new lighting within the local landscape (especially across the Witham Valley) associated with new road junctions and traffic using the LEB.

Mitigation measures proposed to reduce (where possible) impacts arising from the implementation of the scheme comprise of:

- planting of native tree and shrub planting, native species hedgerows and areas of wildflower grassland would be carried out to screen critical views from adjacent receptors, reduce the impact of large-scale earthworks and integrate the scheme with existing landscape features along sections of the LEB route;
- on the deep and extensive cutting south of Washingbrough Road wildflower grassland would be planted on the east facing slopes and a low maintenance grass seed mix on the west facing slopes;
- street lighting would only be used on the approaches to new road junctions and within the Witham Valley so as to reduce the impact of lighting on the open countryside;
- retention of as much of the open rock face of the Greetwell Quarry SSSI as possible and provision of access from the proposed embankment to increase access to the features of geological interest.

The ES concludes that, at a local level, the residual effect of the LEB within the Witham Valley complex (which accounts for approximately a quarter of the schemes extent) would be 'significant'. This arises as a result of the degree to which the prominent embankments and bridge structures, which by their nature are difficult to effectively mitigate, would modify the local

landform, landscape patterns and perception of the Valley to the east of the City of Lincoln.

The visual effects of the LEB range in their significance from 'neutral', 'moderate' and 'adverse'. Proposed mitigation measures would, over time reduce these impacts with the majority being no greater than 'slight' and 'adverse'. A number of receptors would, however, remain subject to a 'moderate' or 'adverse' impact during the winter months although these would reduce as a result of the screening capacity of the proposed planting being strengthened by summer foliage.

Finally, several rights of way would be directly impacted by the LEB either by being crossed or requiring diversions and these impacts are identified as being 'significant' (moderate adverse or greater). Whilst the mitigation measures proposed would help to reduce the impacts of the LEB, it would inevitably give rise to visual impacts on the local landscape and the ES therefore concludes that the LEB would result in 'significant' effects at a local level.

Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration – this chapter assesses the potential noise and vibration impacts at identified sensitive receptors during the construction and operation (i.e. traffic noise) associated with the LEB. The study area for the operational assessment is defined as being 600m from all affected roads within 1km of the boundary of the LEB route and 50m from all affected roads outside the 1km boundary (in line with guidance contained in the DMRB). A total of 19017 residential properties and 181 non-residential noise sensitive receptors were identified as being within this catchment area. The assessment also looks at the potential traffic impacts on affected routes for the Do Minimum (without the scheme) and Do Something (with the scheme) scenarios for the year of proposed opening (i.e. 2017) and 15 years hence (i.e. 2032).

Noise and vibration impacts would vary throughout the construction period and are most likely to be experienced by residents and other sensitive receptors alongside the proposed LEB route. The ES states that it has not been possible to predict noise levels from construction works at this stage as the exact details of the construction methods are not available. However, the ES does include recommended noise threshold limits for construction activities based on guidance given in BS5228 'Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites'. Similarly, without specifics of piling and other construction operations which may be required (including piling rig size, pile diameters, depth and energy per blow, etc) an assessment of the vibration during the proposed construction period has not been possible. However, the ES does indicate that noise and vibration levels would be monitored and appropriate mitigation measures identified and secured as part of a detailed 'Construction Environmental Management Plan (inc. a Noise and Vibration Management Plan)'. Examples of the types of mitigation that could be implemented as part of this plan are as follows (inter alia):

- undertake a letter drop of local residents detailing the duration and type of works to be undertaken and provision of contact information in the event of complaints;
- adoption of best practice measures with regard noise abatement such as switching off of plant and machinery when not in use for long periods of time; use of low emission plant and effective silencers and exhausts and regular maintenance of plant;
- use of temporary noise screens;
- programming works so as to limit working to normal hours of working;

In terms of operational impacts, noise modelling has been carried out to assess the significance of predicted noise level increase and decrease for each of the assessment scenarios (i.e. 'Do Minimum' and 'Do Something'). This assessment shows that in the short term, only 1% of sensitive receptors are anticipated to experience major increases in traffic noise as a result of the opening of the LEB whilst the impact would be negligible or beneficial to 91% of sensitive receptors. In the longer term, under the Do Minimum scenario (i.e. without the scheme) the majority of the receptors studied are predicted to experience a negligible increase in noise level due to anticipated traffic growth over the 15 year period. Under the Do Something scenario (i.e. with the scheme), whilst some properties would experience an increase in traffic noise due to their proximity to the bypass around 89% are predicted to experience no change or a negligible increase as a consequence of the development and resulting increase in traffic growth over the 15 year period.

In order to minimise the adverse impacts of noise and vibration during the operation of the LEB a number of mitigation measures have been proposed which include (inter alia):

- use of low noise surfacing instead of standard hot rolled asphalt along identified sections of the LEB route where major noise impacts are predicted to occur. This includes those sections in close proximity to Hawthorn Road, Bunkers Hill and Whitefriars Road, in the areas of Greetwell Road and in proximity to, and to the south of the village of Washingborough.
- construction of earth bunds throughout the scheme;
- use of the engineered faces/slopes arising from the 'cuttings' created as a result of the vertical alignment of the LEB route;

In conclusion, the greatest impacts of noise and vibration would be on properties located nearest to the proposed LEB route. During the construction period the assessment has indicated that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures the noise impact would be negligible. During the operation of the LEB, whilst properties nearest to the LEB would experience increases in noise levels as a result of the introduction of traffic to the area, subject to the mitigation measures identified being employed the residual noise impact is assessed as being moderate rather than major in terms of its significance.

Chapter 11: Air Quality – this chapters contains an assessment of the potential impacts of the scheme on air quality including impacts associated with dust generated during earthworks, construction activities and associated with working areas, additional emissions from construction traffic, potential impacts on air quality due to changes in traffic flows, speed and composition of roads within the network and the effect of the LEB on carbon-related emissions oxides of nitrogen and particulate matter.

Fugitive dust is identified as the most likely pollutant on air quality during the construction phase and a qualitative assessment of the potential impacts associated with dust emissions has therefore been carried out. Dust emissions could affect people living up to 350m from the construction areas/sites although the level of any impact could vary depending on the type of construction activity, ground conditions, topography, distance and weather conditions. The ES identifies 936 receptors within the 350m of the scheme and of these 85 dwellings, three commercial properties and a play area are located downwind of the potential construction areas and therefore most like to be affected by unmitigated activities. Properties on Stocking Way and eight other dwellings along the route are also within 20m of the LEB's proposed alignment and therefore are considered to be at the highest risk if mitigation measures are not implemented.

The ES states that the impacts of dust emissions could be effectively controlled at source and generally be avoided by good site practice. A range of mitigation measures to minimise the effects of airborne dust are identified in the ES and include (inter alia):

- dampening down of areas at risk of creating dust;
- utilising water suppression (where appropriate) on plant/machinery used for earthworks/material cutting;
- controlling construction activities to minimise dust release;
- enclosing significant material stockpiles as far as is practicable and/or not stockpiling fine materials to an excessive height so as to reduce exposure to wind;
- locating plant away from residential boundaries (where practical);
- speed limits for construction plant/machinery to minimise dust;
- soiling, seeding, planting or sealing of completed earthworks as soon as reasonably practicable.

The above measures would reduce the magnitude and duration of dust deposition on all receptors. In relation to those receptors within 20m of the proposed route (and therefore at highest risk) the measures proposed would ensure that the temporary impacts experienced would be 'slight adverse' for the construction period. The ES states that the dust mitigation measures could be secured as part of a 'Construction Environmental Management Plan' and would ensure that any dust arising during the construction of the LEB would be within acceptable levels.

During the operation of the LEB the potential impacts on air quality are primarily identified as being those associated with pollutants and pollution

derived from traffic. The ES compares existing background pollutant concentrations (nitrogen oxides NO₂ and particulate matter PM₁₀) with those that are predicted to exist once the LEB was operational. The assessment shows that the annual mean NO₂ and PM₁₀ concentrations at the majority of the identified worst case receptors (58 out of 60) are predicted to experience an imperceptible or a small change with only two receptors predicted to experience a medium beneficial change. The most improved receptor is located on the Wragby Road (A15)/Pottergate junction although there is predicted to be a small increase in NO₂ concentrations at the A1434 (Newark Road/Stanley Street) junction. Any such increase is, however, small and would not exceed the air quality objective limits for the City.

Overall, the ES states that the change in ambient air concentrations associated with the implementation of the LEB would be 'negligible' to 'small'. The overall impact of the development on air quality is predicted to be 'slight beneficial' to 'negligible' for the two pollutants of health concerns. As such no specific mitigation measures are proposed as they are not considered necessary.

Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage – this chapter considers the potential impacts of the LEB on both known and potential cultural heritage assets (e.g. archaeological remains, historic buildings and historic landscapes). The assessment covers all assets within the footprint of the LEB and within a 200m buffer zone. The assessment also covers all assets within the footprint of the scheme and 1km from the scheme boundary in order to assess the impact on setting.

Archaeology: During the construction phase, short term or temporary impacts on known archaeological assets are identified as being visual and noise intrusion associated with the construction activities and movement of plant and machinery. These short term impacts would particularly affect the scheduled Greetwell Medieval Village and its associated post-medieval landscape setting and two barrow cemeteries which have been identified as being within close proximity to the LEB route.

Permanent construction impacts are identified as being the loss of, and damage to, archaeological remains/sites as a result of the construction, deep excavation and engineering works as well as potential damage caused by the movement of site vehicles and plant. Without mitigation the majority of these impacts are predicted to be of 'minor' magnitude, however, 'major adverse' impacts are predicted at 19 identified sites within the study area.

In terms of long-term and operational impacts, again these would largely include increased road noise and the introduction of a new visual component within the setting of the Greetwell Medieval Village and two barrow cemeteries. The relationship of Greetwell Medieval Village with the city of Lincoln and the Cathedral would be obscured by the presence of the road, however, the Medieval Village is already well bounded by planting, meaning the visual relationship between the two is already limited. The road would also truncate the barrow cemeteries causing disturbance to their

setting through the introduction of new infrastructure, however, they are already separated by field boundaries and ditches and this, combined with limited visual evidence and poor preservation of the barrows, already disturbs the group as a whole. The ES therefore states that the unmitigated impact of the LEB on these features is assessed as being minor and moderate.

In order to avoid or minimise impacts during both the construction and operational phases of the development a range of mitigation measures have been incorporated/proposed as part of the scheme and these include the following:

- where possible to preserve archaeological deposits/features in situ;
- where preservation in situ is not feasible/acceptable, then the appropriate mitigation strategy would be preservation by record. Such measures to be adopted include:
 - detailed archaeological excavation of selected sites;
 - strip, mapping and sampling of selected sites;
 - creation of exclusion zones using protective fencing around selected sites which are not within the footprint of the road but which could be at risk of damage from construction traffic;
 - adoption of a targeted watching brief for areas between Wragby Road and Heighington Road and in the areas immediately adjacent to Bloxholm Lane and Sleaford Road (A15);
 - adoption of a general archaeological watching brief for all other areas throughout the scheme.
- to mitigate against long-term operational impacts on Greetwell Medieval Village landscape planting would be carried out to soften the appearance of the new scheme;
- the carrying out of detailed photographic and topographic surveys of the barrow cemeteries and their settings to help preserve the sites by record.

Built Heritage: During the construction phase, the potential impacts are largely identified as being those associated with noise and visual intrusion arising from the construction activities. In most cases, the unmitigated impacts are assessed as being 'negligible' to 'moderate' in magnitude. However, during the construction of the LEB a railway underbridge at Washingborough Road would be removed. Whilst this bridge is not listed or benefits from any other designation, the permanent impact of the LEB scheme on this individual site is assessed to be of 'major' magnitude.

During the operation of the LEB, potential unmitigated impacts are identified as also being those associated with noise and visual intrusion but this time related to traffic using the LEB and the visual impacts of new structures and lighting within the landscape setting. The ES assesses these impacts as being 'negligible' to 'minor' in terms of their magnitude of impact.

Mitigation measures proposed to minimise the adverse impacts of the LEB on historic buildings include:

- carrying out of an English Heritage Level 2 Historic Building Record for the railway underpass that would be removed as part of the development. This would include a written record, photographic record and measured plan;
- use of new hedgerow, tree and shrub planting along the road embankments to help the scheme integrate into the landscape and to soften long distance views to and from the built heritage assets;
- use of directional lighting to reduce visual impacts on the setting of built heritage assets at night.

Subject to the implementation of the above mitigation measures, the overall impact of the LEB on the identified sites are considered to range from 'negligible' to 'slight' in magnitude. Furthermore the ES states that a general reduction in traffic levels through Lincoln would have a beneficial positive impact upon Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas within the city centre.

Historic Landscape: During the construction phase, short term and temporary impacts on the historic landscape are identified as being those deriving from the excavation, engineering and construction works and include the severance of field boundaries, introduction of road junctions and elevated walkways which are out of keeping with the established road pattern, road noise and visual intrusion due to the introduction of street lighting.

Once fully operational, the LEB would impact on the historic landscape by its introduction of infrastructure within a predominately rural setting. These will not only have visual impacts but also noise impacts.

In order to mitigate and minimise the short and long term impacts of the LEB a range of measures have been proposed which include:

- carrying out an English Heritage Level 1 photographic survey of the landscape prior to the commencement of any construction works. This would involve a general photographic record of the site and the mapping of any landscape features (i.e. field boundaries);
- retention (where possible) of existing hedgerows and reinstatement of hedgerows that are removed during construction of the LEB;
- landscape planting using species that are characteristic to the local landscape throughout the scheme.

The ES states that whilst the landscape survey aims to mitigate the impact of the LEB on the historic landscape it would, given the nature of the development, have an adverse effect. Landscape planting would go some way to reducing the visual impacts on the wider setting but would not totally screen this. Therefore despite the implementation of the mitigation measures the magnitude of the impact is assessed as being 'moderate'.

Chapter 13: Nature Conservation – the ES contains a desk-based study, extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and assessments/surveys for individual species (including legally protected species). The majority of the presence/absence surveys for individual species were undertaken in 2008 but further field surveys were carried out in 2012. The ES indicates that the habitats identified during these field surveys remain broadly the same as they did in 2008 and therefore the ES argues that the results/findings of the original surveys are still relevant. For each of these elements the ES identifies the potential impacts of the LEB and an assessment of the significance of these to the nature conservation feature/species. Significance is defined based upon the geographical scale at which the impact is considered to be material in terms of maintaining the nature conservation status of the feature. An impact can therefore be significant at Local, County, Regional, National and International scales.

A summary of the predicted impacts during both the construction and operational phases of the LEB on the designated and non-designated sites and individual species and features of nature conservation interest are as follows:

Designated and non-designated sites

Greetwell Quarry Site of Scientific Importance – this site is designated for its geological features (i.e. exposures of Lincolnshire Limestone) which are considered to be of National Importance. The LEB would result in the severance and loss of land which is situated in the south east corner of the site. This land is currently comprised of improved grassland and areas of exposed quarry face and would be lost to incorporate the alignment of the LEB carriageway along this section of the route. Impacts on the SSSI during the construction phase would include the destruction and loss of part of the exposed faces and habitats within the quarry. Potential impacts during the operation of the LEB include disturbance from traffic noise and vibrations and lighting. Without mitigation the significance of these impacts are assessed as being ‘major negative’ at a County scale (for the construction phase) and ‘moderate negative’ at a Local scale (for the operational phases).

Greetwell Wood Site of Nature Conservation Importance – this site is of County Importance. During the construction phase, the alignment of the LEB would result in the loss of 0.42 hectares of broadleaf woodland including nine mature ash and sycamore trees and associated ground flora and scrub. Disturbance to the habitat would also be likely during the construction phases. During the operation of the LEB, impacts identified include disturbance from traffic noise and lighting. Without mitigation the ES assesses the significance of these impacts as being ‘moderate negative’ at a County and Local scale, however, once replacement habitat is established the long-term residual impacts are considered to be ‘negligible’.

Canwick Hall Wood Site of Nature Conservation Importance – this site is also of County Importance and comprises of a former quarry with plantation

woodland, improved grassland and arable habitats. The main impacts identified are the potential disturbance to habitats in the woodland during both the construction and operational phases. Without mitigation the significance of these impacts are assessed as being 'minor negative' at a Local scale, however, with mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

Washingborough Junction Site of Nature Conservation Importance – this site is also of County Importance and lies adjacent to the River Witham and South Delph comprising of tussocky vegetation, seasonally wet or damp areas, deep ditches and species rich hedgerows. The main impacts identified are the potential pollution of the watercourse as a result of uncontrolled run-off and dust during both the construction and operational phases. Without mitigation the significance of this impact is assessed as being 'minor negative' at a Local scale, however, with mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

River Witham Local Wildlife Site – this site is also of County Importance. The proposed road is planned to cross the River Witham and North and South Delphs via a bridge passing over all three waterways. Potential impacts include the loss of broadleaved trees and scrub and disturbance to habitats adjacent to the development during its construction. There is also the potential for the shading of aquatic habitats and disruption of the hydrology of wetland habitats associated with the River Witham. During the operational phase, impacts identified include disturbance from traffic and pollution as a result of uncontrolled run-off from the development. Without mitigation the ES assesses the significance of these impacts as being 'moderate negative' at a County and Local scale (for the construction phase) and 'moderate negative' and 'minor negative' at a Local scale (for the operational phase). However, with mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

Greetwell Junction Railway Embankment Local Wildlife Site – this site is of County Importance and is characterised by sparse vegetation and scattered scrub. The construction of the LEB would result in the loss of most of this site and without mitigation, the significance of this impact is assessed as being of 'moderate negative' at a County scale. During its operation the main potential impact on those parts of the site that would remain is potential pollution from dust. Without mitigation, the significance of this impact is assessed as being 'minor negative' at a Local scale, however, once compensatory replacement habitat has established (see mitigation measures below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

Willingham Fen West Local Wildlife Site – this site is of County Importance and is an area of marshy grassland that provides important habitat for breeding birds. During the construction phase, potential impacts include the loss of land and disturbance to adjacent habitats and individual species. Other impacts identified include potential for shading of aquatic habitats by a

temporary bridge structure across the fen, disruption of the hydrology of wetland habitats and potential for pollution from site run-off. During the operational phase, potential impacts also include potential disturbance from traffic and pollution to watercourse from dust. Without mitigation the ES assesses the significance of these impacts as being 'moderate negative' at a Local scale (for the construction phase) and 'minor negative' at a Local scale (for the operational phase). However, with mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

Bloxholm Lane Local Wildlife Site – this site is of County Importance and has been designated due to the presence of calcareous grassland on the roadside. The construction works and alignment of the LEB around the Bloxholm Lane section of the route would result in the direct loss of areas of this calcareous grassland habitat. During the operational phase of the LEB, potential impacts include increased risk of disturbance from traffic noise, vibration and lighting. Without mitigation the significance of these impacts are assessed as being 'minor negative' at a Local scale. However, with mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

Cliff Farm Footpaths Local Wildlife Site – this site is of County Importance and comprises of the verges of two footpaths which have been designated due to the presence of calcareous grassland. The construction works and alignment of the LEB would result in the direct loss of part of this site and therefore loss of calcareous grassland habitat. During the operational phase, the potential impacts include increased risk of disturbance from traffic noise, vibration and lighting. Without mitigation the significance of these impacts are assessed as being 'minor negative' at a Local scale, however, with mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

In addition to the above sites, three other Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) were identified as being within the ES assessment area. These sites are all of County Importance but given their distance from the LEB are not predicted to be impacted upon during either the construction or operational phases of the scheme. The three sites are Cow Paddle Railway Embankment LWS, Fox Covert, Cherry Willingham LWS and Canwick Park Golf Course LWS.

Individual species

Bats – Bats are of County Importance. During the construction of the LEB, potential impacts identified include the loss of roosting and foraging habitats including 0.42 hectares of Greetwell Wood SNCI, loss of trees and hedgerows, scrub and grasslands. There would also be the potential for severance and restriction of flight-lines/commuting routes and disturbance as a result of noise, vibration and lighting during the construction works. During the operation of the LEB, impacts also include severance of flight-lines/commuting routes with increased mortality due to a higher traffic flows within the area and also disturbance associated with road noise, vibration

and lighting. Without mitigation the ES assesses the significance of these impacts as being 'major negative' at a County scale and 'moderate negative' at a Local scale (for the construction phase) and 'major negative' and 'moderate negative' at a Local scale and 'moderate negative' at a County scale (for the operational phase). With mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible' although there would still be some negative impact at a local scale.

Water Voles – Water Voles are of County Importance. During the construction of the LEB, potential impacts identified include the loss of riparian habitat (e.g. along the River Witham and adjacent watercourses) caused by vegetation clearance and site construction works. During the operational phase, predicted impacts include increased disturbance as a result of traffic vibration and noise as well as a potential reduction in plant growth and therefore food availability due to the shading effect caused by the bridge structures. Without mitigation the significance of these impacts are assessed as ranging from 'moderate negative' and 'minor negative' at a Local scale (for the construction phase) and 'minor negative' at a Local scale (for the operational phase). However, with mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

Badgers – Badgers are of Local Importance. During the construction phase, the potential impacts identified include the loss and destruction of setts, severance of existing badger territories and pathways and disturbance due to noise and light associated with the operation of heavy plant and machinery. During the operational phase, impacts also include severance of existing territories and foraging habitats and increased badger deaths due to higher traffic flows within the foraging area. Disturbance would also continue to be incurred as a result of increased noise and light associated with traffic using the bypass. Without mitigation the significance of these impacts are assessed as being 'moderate negative' at a Local scale, however, with mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

Otters – Otters are of County Importance. Otter surveys were carried out in 2008 along five watercourses that were identified as being potentially suitable to support this species. However, no evidence of otters was recorded at any of the sites surveyed and the field survey conducted in 2012 confirmed that the habitats remain broadly the same as they did in 2008. As a result the ES argues that the results/findings of the original surveys are still relevant and any impacts would be 'negligible' in the long-term.

Barn Owl – Barn Owls are of County Importance and breeding sites have been identified on either side of the proposed LEB route and in the surrounding area. During the construction phase, potential impacts have been identified as loss or roosting habitat as a result of site clearance works and disturbance from noise and vibration from construction traffic. During the operational phase, impacts include loss of foraging habitat as a result of

the loss of hedgerows and arable land, severance of flight-lines, direct mortality due to the increased traffic flows and noise and light disturbance associated with traffic using the LEB. Without mitigation the significance of these impacts are assessed as being 'moderate negative' at a Local scale, however, with mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

Kingfisher – Kingfishers are of Local Importance and a habitat suitability survey was conducted in 2012 to assess the potential for watercourses to support populations of kingfisher and to assess and potential impacts of the development on this species. During the construction phase, potential impacts identified include loss of breeding habitat along watercourses and disturbance and restriction of access to nest holes. During the operational phase, impacts identified include potential loss of habitat and impacts on foraging habitat as a result of any pollution of watercourses of marshy grassland as result of run-off or accidental spillages derived from the LEB. Without mitigation these impacts are assessed as being of 'moderate negative' significance at a Local scale (for the construction phase) and 'minor negative' at a Local scale (for the operational phase). However, with mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

Reptiles (Grass Snakes) – Grass snakes have been identified as being present within the development footprint and these are of Local Importance. During the construction phase, impacts identified include damage and loss of habitat and accidental deaths during site clearance works. During the operational phase, impacts include severance of suitable habitat which could also reduce breeding success as well as direct increased mortality rates as a result of increased traffic flow. Without mitigation the significance of these impacts are assessed as being 'minor negative' at less than Local scale, however, with mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

Breeding Birds – are of Local Importance. During the construction phase, potential impacts identified include the loss of 0.42 ha of woodland habitat and 7km of hedgerows as well as the loss of arable land which all provide a key resource for breeding and wintering birds. Disturbance would also arise as a result of noise and lighting associated with both the construction and operation of the LEB and bird death rates may also increase as a result of the introduction/increased traffic in the area. Without mitigation, the significance of these impacts are assessed as being 'moderate negative' at a Local scale, however, with mitigation measures in place (detailed below) the long-term residual impacts are considered to be 'negligible'.

Great Crested Newts – presence/absence surveys for great crested newts were carried out in 2008, however, at that time no individuals or populations of great crested newt were identified. However, during the 2012 Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey a single newt was identified within the pond located within Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI. This pond would be lost as a result of the alignment of the LEB. Due to the protected status and presence of great

crested newts further investigations and surveys were commissioned to be carried out during May 2013 in order to determine if the pond is used by newts as a breeding site, the size of any population present and what level of mitigation (if necessary) would be required.

At the time of writing this report the results of the further survey/ investigations carried out in May 2013 were not available, however, a summary of the findings and any recommendations regarding mitigation as well as comments received from interested consultees in response to that information will be reported to the Planning and Regulation Committee before the application is debated.

Mitigation Measures – a package of mitigation measures have been proposed within the ES which would be adopted to minimise and/or offset any adverse impacts. A summary of the main mitigation measures are as follows (inter alia):

- polluting materials would not be stored in works areas located within areas of significant biodiversity value or within 50m of watercourse in order to minimise risks of pollution;
- existing trees and hedgerows would be retained (where possible);
- creation/replacement of habitats lost as a result of the scheme including new wetlands, ponds or swales, etc;
- carrying out landscape planting along the route including new hedgerows, tree and shrub planting;
- an Ecological Clerk of Works would be available to advise on any unexpected ecological issues that may arise during the course of works;
- retention of as much of the open rock face of the Greetwell Quarry SSSI as possible and provision of access from the proposed embankment to increase access to the features of geological interest;
- carrying out of pre-construction/site clearance surveys to identify the potential presence of individual species within the development site (i.e. bats, breeding birds, badgers, reptiles);
- timing of site operations and vegetation clearance works to the appropriate times of year so as not to impact upon the breeding/nesting seasons of individual species;
- erection and provision of bat boxes and bat bricks on trees and structures within the scheme;
- a landscape and ecological mitigation plan would be prepared and put in place to protect designated sites to ensure that the sites overall integrity and conservation objectives are maintained. This would include planting with appropriate species compositions within the extents of the designated sites and establishment of new habitat to replace affected areas of woodland, grassland and scrub.

Chapter 14: Land Use, Community and Private Assets – most of the land that would be affected by the LEB would be arable farmland with some grazing land alongside the north of the River Witham. The proposed bypass would result in the permanent loss of agricultural land some of which is

classed as being of the 'best and most versatile' in terms of its grade and quality. The agricultural land is mainly owned by institutions such as the Church Commissioners for England, the City of Lincoln Council and Oxford College and is let to farmers on a mix of traditional agricultural and modern farm business tenancies. The impacts of the bypass on this existing land use and the farm businesses are identified as including:

- the severance of farmland resulting in smaller, irregular shaped fields;
- permanent loss of workable land either as a result of the bypass carriageway or associated works such as surface water lagoons or landscaping works;
- loss of existing fields accesses resulting in the need to undertake significant detours in order to access land;
- disruption of existing land drainage systems.

In addition to farmland, the other major existing land use affected by the LEB would be Greetwell Hollow Quarry which is now designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The impacts of this land take on the SSSI and the mitigation measures proposed to address these have been discussed in Chapter 13 (above). Furthermore, the proposed scheme would not have any impact on land currently allocated for development or any planning developments that have either been started or that are not currently under construction.

In respect of future development, the LEB route would not impact upon land lying to the east of Lincoln which could be developed in the future as an urban extension to the city (as previously supported by the East Midlands Regional Plan). The East Midlands Regional Plan has now been revoked, however, the expansion of Lincoln is to continue to be promoted and identified through the Central Lincolnshire Core Strategy. The Core Strategy will set out the future planning policy strategy for Central Lincolnshire and is being developed as a partnership between the County, City of Lincoln, North Kesteven and West Lindsey District Councils.

Finally, the development would not result in the loss of any land from existing community land uses (e.g. golf course, recreation grounds, etc). A number of public rights of way would, however, be affected by the scheme and the impacts of these are considered in Chapter 15 (below).

Overall, the impacts on land use, community and private assets are considered to be 'neutral'. Residual adverse impacts are expected as a result of the loss of agricultural and severance of these farm lands.

Chapter 15: Effects on Travellers – this chapter assesses the potential impacts of the LEB on all travellers. In this context all travellers refers to pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and vehicles users.

Predicted impacts (negative and positive) during the construction and operation of the LEB include (inter alia):

- temporary closure and severance of existing routes (including footpaths, cyclepaths and highways) during the construction of the LEB;
- disruption and increased congestion and driver stress due to road closures, diversions and route uncertainty during the construction works;
- permanent closure of the eastern section of an existing footpath (Gtwl/140/1) which runs between Wragby Road and Hawthorn Road which would be severed by the bypass and which lies within the development footprint;
- diversion of the public footpath (Gtwl/139/2) on the western side of Greetwell Fields to be diverted to link into Greetwell Fields;
- minor impacts on the amenity of non-motorised users using routes along the banks of the River Witham after the opening of the bypass;
- reduction of traffic within Lincoln as a result of traffic using the LEB. This would improve conditions for non-motorised users;
- reduced severance between communities north and south of the River Witham through the provision of a new link bridge and cycleway/footpath;
- provision of new facilities to allow access across the LEB (e.g. new overbridges and underpass) and access to the Sustrans route;
- provision of new cycleway/footpath along the whole route of the LEB;

Mitigation measures proposed during the construction phase include (inter alia):

- provision of alternative routes for those temporarily severed/closed during construction works (where possible). These diversions may increase journey times/length for users of these routes;
- construction works to be programmed such that planned closures are implemented only when alternative routes or suitable diversion are provided;
- clear signage to ensure safe pedestrian routes across working areas;

No mitigation measures are considered necessary during the operation of the LEB.

The ES concludes that there would be temporary and permanent impacts on non-motorised users and road users during construction. However, with the proposed scheme design, these impacts are either reduced or eliminated. Provision has been made in the design of the scheme and measures incorporated to ensure the reduction in severance as a result of the proposed scheme. The construction of the LEB would reduce traffic within Lincoln thus improving conditions for non-motorised users and encouraging people to either continue or take up walking and cycling. The assessment has also demonstrated that without the LEB in place driver stress levels on the existing A15 would remain high, however, with the LEB drivers travelling north or south would encounter less volume of traffic which would have a beneficial impact on driver frustration.

Chapter 16: Interactions and Cumulative Impacts – this chapter identifies any likely significant cumulative effects and interactions between the LEB scheme and existing or approved developments in the area.

During the construction phase, there is likely to be an increased impact on nearby sensitive receptors from the combined effects on air quality, noise and landscape. There would be negative impacts on air quality from construction traffic and dust, an increase in noise levels from construction activities and a degradation of visual amenity from the construction activities and site clearances. The impact would be likely to be greater than predicted in the separate assessments contained within the ES (Chapters 7-15), however, the construction works would deploy mitigation measures that would be widely deployed to control impacts such as noise, air quality and landscape.

There is also the potential for cumulative impacts developing during the construction phase of the LEB particularly if the construction phases of the LEB coincide with those of any other committed developments. Areas that have the potential to have a cumulative impact interaction during construction on nearby receptors include noise and vibration, landscape, air quality, landscape, ecology, water environment and effects on all travellers. However, mitigation and best practice measures are proposed as part of the LEB development and if permission were granted for the LEB, the development would be required to be carried out and implemented in accordance with these measures. Similarly, it is assumed that other developments would be required to implement methodologies to reduce their impacts also. As such, it is considered the potential cumulative impact would be minor.

Overall, it is concluded that no significant cumulative impacts are anticipated for the scheme provided all the mitigation measures and commitments detailed within the ES are adopted and implemented.

Non-technical summary – this document gives a brief overview of the main findings of the ES in an easily understandable and accessible format.

Site and Surroundings

19. The proposed route of the LEB runs from the junction of the A158 and A15 north east of Lincoln City Centre. It would run along a corridor east of Lincoln, crossing North Delph, River Witham and South Delph prior to rising to cross the B1188 Lincoln Road east of Canwick and then continuing through agricultural land to meet the A15 south of Bracebridge Heath. A full description of the route and the landscape and its surroundings has been given in earlier in this report (see 'Route Description' section of this report).

Main Planning Considerations

National Guidance

20. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and is a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. For decision taking this means:

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

Consequently, proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved and development that conflicts should be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The main policies/statements set out in the NPPF which are relevant to this proposal are as follows (summarised):

Paragraph 31 – Local Authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges, roadside facilities for motorists or transport investment necessary to support strategies for the growth of ports, airports or other major generators of travel demand in their areas.

Paragraph 32 – All developments that generate significant amounts of movements should be supported by a Transport Statement or Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:

- the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

Paragraph 41 – Local Planning Authorities should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to wide transport choice.

Paragraph 103 – When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere and only consider development appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where, informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment following the Sequential and Exception Test, it can be demonstrated that:

- within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; and
- development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant, including safe access and escape routes where required, and that any residual risk can be safely managed, including emergency planning; and it gives priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems.

Paragraph 109 – The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;
- recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;
- minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;
- preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.

Paragraph 112 – Local Planning Authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality land.

Paragraph 118 – When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles:

- if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
- proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) likely to have an adverse effects on a SSSI (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted. Where an adverse effect on the sites notified

special interest features is likely, an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site and any broader impacts;

- opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in an around developments should be encouraged.

Paragraph 120 – To prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land stability, planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location. The effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the areas or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution, should be taken into account.

Paragraph 123 – Planning policies and decisions should aim to:

- avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse effects on health and quality of life as a result of new development;
- mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from new development, including through the use of conditions;
- recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established; and
- identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.

Paragraph 128 – In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. Where a site includes or has the potential to include heritage assets within archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Paragraph 132 – When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important and asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional.

Paragraph 135 – The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the

application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Paragraph 139 – Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

Paragraphs 186 and 187 – Local planning authorities should approach decision-taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development and should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible. Local planning authorities should work proactively with applicant to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

Paragraph 215 – states that 12 months after the publication of the NPPF (March 2012) due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the framework the greater the weight that may be given). This is of relevance to the three District Council Local Plans referred to below (i.e. City of Lincoln Local Plan 1998, West Lindsey Local Plan 2006 and North Kesteven Local Plan 2007).

Local Plan Context

21. The City of Lincoln Local Plan 1998 (CLLP) forms part of the Development Plan and therefore, as confirmed by the NPPF, due weight should be given to relevant policies within the Plan according to their degree of consistency with the policies of the NPPF. The following policies are considered to be generally consistent with the NPPF and of relevance to this proposal (summarised):

Policy 5 (Strategic Network of Cycleways, Footpaths and Bridleways) restricts developments which would hinder the completion of the strategic network of cycleways, footpaths and bridleways. Support is given to developments which would make suitable provision for stretches of cycleway, footpaths or bridleways to connect with or parts of the network.

Policy 14 (Strategic and Major Road Proposals) states that land required for the construction of the Eastern Bypass will be safeguarded and planning permission will not be granted for any development which would hinder the construction of that road.

Policy 34 (Design and Amenity Standards) states planning permission will be granted for developments which meet a range of criteria identified in the policy. Such criterion include the need for developments to be of a complementary size, scale, design and layout, include proposals for

appropriate boundary treatment, not adversely impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents, etc.

Policy 38E (Development Adjacent to Greetwell Quarry) restricts residential development adjacent to Greetwell Quarry.

Policy 44A (Sites of Special Scientific Interest or other Critical Natural Assets) states planning permission will not be granted for any development that would diminish, or in any other way adversely affect, the interest or importance of a Site of Special Scientific Interest. In respect of other critical natural assets, permission will only be granted if it is satisfied that the development would not harm the ecological, scientific, geological, geomorphological or landscape qualities and interest of the site and designated area.

Policy 44C (Protected Species) restricts development which would harm protected species unless adequate protection can be secured by planning conditions or obligations.

Policy 45A (Trees and Other Ecological and Landscape Features on Development Sites) requires all new development proposals to retain as many trees and existing ecological and landscape features within the landscape as possible.

Policy 46A (Woodland and Other Major Planting Initiatives) seeks to secure the provision of new woodland and major planting schemes to provide linear buffers.

Policy 46B (Protecting the Water Environment) seeks to protect existing lakes, ponds and watercourses from development unless adequate provisions are made to minimise any adverse impacts.

Policy 55 (Long Views Into and Out of the City) restricts developments which would obstruct views into and out of the city including those of the historic hilltop city and/or Lincoln Edge and Witham Gap from identified locations including (inter alia) the A57 and Eastern Bypass and line of the Eastern Bypass where it crosses the floor of the Witham Gap.

Policy 70 (Greetwell Quarry) supports development proposals for the following uses within Greetwell Quarry – business and general industrial uses (B1 and B2); public open space; storage and distribution uses (B8), and; Park and Ride.

The West Lindsey Local Plan 2006 (WLLP) forms part of the Development Plan and therefore, as confirmed by the NPPF, due weight should be given to relevant policies within the Plan according to their degree of consistency with the policies of the NPPF. The following policies are considered to be generally consistent with the NPPF and of relevance to this proposal (summarised):

Policy STRAT1 (Development Requiring Planning Permission) states planning permission will be granted for development proposals which meet a range of criteria identified in the policy. Such criterion include the need for developments to be of a complementary size, scale, design and layout, include proposals for appropriate boundary treatment, not adversely impact upon the character, appearance and amenities of neighbouring land, amenities of residents, etc.

Policy STRAT3 (Development in the Countryside) restricts development in the countryside unless it is essential to the needs of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, mineral extraction or other land use which necessarily requires a countryside location or otherwise meets an objective supported by other Plan policies.

Policy SUS1 (Development Proposals and Transport Choice) supports developments which generate a significant volume of traffic movement, when they are located where they can be easily and efficiently served by an existing or expandable public transport service, and where there are good local pedestrian and cycle links available or to be provided.

Policy SUS4 (Cycle and Pedestrian Routes in Development Proposals) restricts developments unless the needs of cyclists and pedestrians have been considered and, where practicable opportunities exist, facilities for the safe and convenient passage of cyclists and pedestrians are incorporated into the development.

Policy ECON13 (Lincoln Eastern Bypass) states that planning permission will not be granted for developments which would prejudice the implementation of the bypass along the route as identified on the Proposals Map.

Policy CORE10 (Open Space and Landscaping within Developments) requires all new development proposals to retain as many existing trees and landscaping features as possible and include proposals for new landscaping.

Policy CRT9 (Public Rights of Way Affected by Development) restricts developments which would extinguish or adversely affect an existing public right of way unless an alternative route or diversion is provided which would not be significantly detrimental to users.

Policy NBE10 (Protection of Landscape Character in Development) restricts developments where they are likely to have an adverse impact on the features, setting or general appearance of the landscape character and landscape amenity value. Proposals will be supported where they respect and enhance local distinctiveness, reflect local styles in terms of their scale, design and materials, maintain or enhance important landscape features and not be detrimental to skylines or important views.

Policy NBE11 (Development Affecting Sites of Special Scientific Interest and National Nature Reserves) restricts developments that either directly or indirectly affects such sites unless there is an overriding national need for the development and there is no other site available for the particular purpose and the reasons for the development clearly outweigh the nature conservation value of the site itself and the national policy to safeguard such sites. Where development is permitted, conditions will be imposed on the planning permission to require that before development commences: (i) adequate opportunity is provided to enable proper recording of the site; (ii) where appropriate, practical measures are taken by the developer to enable the rescue and re-colonisation of species to other suitable existing or new sites.

Policy NBE12 (Development Affecting Locally Designated Nature Conservation Sites and Ancient Woodlands) restricts developments unless there is a demonstrable overriding regional or local need for the development which cannot be accommodated elsewhere and the reason for the development clearly outweighs the need to safeguard the substantive nature conservation value of the site.

Policy NBE13 (Nature Conservation in Wildlife Corridors) restricts developments that would result in the loss or cause significant harm to important wildlife habitats.

Policy NBE14 (Waste Water Disposal) requires developments to include provision for attenuation or mitigation measures to deal with foul and surface waters arising from the development.

Policy NBE15 (Water Quality and Supply) restricts developments which would constitute a risk to the quality or quantity of water resources or to amenity, nature conservation or fisheries through pollution from development.

Policy NBE16 (Culverting Watercourses) permits the culverting of watercourses only where it is essential for public safety or to provide access across the watercourse.

Policy NBE17 (Potentially Polluting Uses) supports developments which would not adversely affect or give rise to pollution of water, air or soil, noise, dust, vibration, light heat or radiation.

Policy NBE18 (Light Pollution) restricts developments which include lighting scheme unless they propose the minimum amount of lighting necessary to achieve its purpose and minimise glare and light spillage from the sit. In determining proposals, consideration will be given to the aesthetic effect of the light produced and to its effect on local residents, vehicle users, pedestrians and the visibility of the night sky.

The following policy is also relevant as it relates to land adjoining the application site:

Policy STRAT10 (Longer Term Development Options – Lincoln and Bardney) this policy relates to land located adjacent to the bypass which is identified as potential future development land for mixed uses including housing, employment and transport. However, the land shall not be released for development until a strategic need for the land has identified as part of an Areas Action Plan as part of the replacement Local Development Framework.

The North Kesteven Local Plan (NKLP) 2007 forms part of the Development Plan and therefore, as confirmed by the NPPF, due weight should be given to relevant policies within the Plan according to their degree of consistency with the policies of the NPPF. The following policies are considered to be generally consistent with the NPPF and of relevance to this proposal (summarised):

Policy C2 (Development in the Countryside) restricts development in the countryside unless it meets a range of criteria identified in the policy.

Policy C3 (Agricultural Land Quality) seeks to protect the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land from development.

Policy C5 (Effects on Amenities) supports proposals that would not adversely affect the amenities enjoyed by other land users to an acceptable degree.

Policy C7 (Comprehensive Development) supports developments which would not prejudice the future development of other land identified for development in the Local Plan or prevent or hinder access to other land or introduce a new use to an area that is incompatible with a proposal that is under active consideration.

Policy C10 (Flood Risk) supports developments where they would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or unacceptably increase flood risk elsewhere.

Policy C11 (Pollution) supports developments which would not give rise to unacceptable risks of pollution to receptors such flora and fauna, water, air and soil and the general amenity of the area.

Policy C14 (Surface Water Disposal) supports developments which include measures designed to safely manage surface water run-off.

Policy C19 (Landscaping) supports developments that make appropriate provision for high quality landscaping.

Policy C22 (External Lighting Schemes) states that external lighting schemes associated with development proposals shall ensure that they do not compromise highway safety; will not adversely affect the amenities of nearby land-users; and will not adversely affect the character of the area.

Policy T4 (Safety) supports developments that would not adversely affect the safety of people using roads, cycleways, footpaths, bridleways or railways.

Policy T7 (Lincoln Eastern Bypass) restricts developments which would prevent or hinder the provision of desirable infrastructure. In particular this seeks to safeguard land required in connection with the construction and operation of the proposed Lincoln Eastern Bypass.

RST2 (Public Rights of Way) restricts developments which would adversely affect an existing public right of way.

Policy RST4 (Public Access to the Countryside) supports developments that will increase public access to the countryside.

Policy LW1 (Landscape Conservation) seeks to protect the distinctive landscapes of the identified Landscape Character Areas and any special features which contribute to that character. Where development is acceptable, it will be required to contribute to the local distinctiveness of the area, be well integrated into the local landscape character, protect any features of importance to the local scene, and respect any important views.

LW2 (Green Wedges) restricts development within areas designated as a Green Wedge which would not adversely affect, the landscape setting of the City of Lincoln and any other settlement; the appearance or landscape character of the Green Wedge; the recreational value of the Green Wedge, and; the wildlife value of the Green Wedge.

LW3 (Visual Amenity Areas) states permission will only be granted for proposals that adversely affect a designated Visual Amenity Area where the development clearly overrides the amenity value of the area.

LW4 (Sites of Special Scientific Interest) restricts developments that either directly or indirectly affect a SSSI unless the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the likely impacts of the site that make it of special scientific interest, cannot be feasibly located in a less sensitive location and (where appropriate) the implementation of measures to minimise, mitigate or compensate for any harm is secured by means of conditions or a legal agreement.

LW6 (County Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves) restricts developments that directly or indirectly affect a site unless the need for the development clearly outweighs the importance of the designated site, cannot be feasibly located in a less sensitive location, and (where appropriate) the implementation of measures to minimise, mitigate or compensate for any harm is secured by means of conditions or a legal agreement.

LW7 (Features of Importance for Wildlife) seeks to protect important habitats or existing landscape features (e.g. ponds, hedgerows, woodland, etc) that are important to wild flora and fauna unless the need for development clearly outweighs the importance of the feature and (where appropriate) the implementation of measures to minimise, mitigate or compensate for any harm is secured by means of conditions or a legal agreement.

Policy LW8 (Protected Species) seeks to ensure that protected species or habitats are not adversely affected by development proposals.

Policies HE1 to HE3 (Protection of Features of Archaeological Interest) these policies collectively seek to protect archaeological deposits and features of interest from development. Developments that affect a site where evidence suggests that archaeological remains are likely to be present must be accompanied by an assessment identifying the extent and importance of any remains, together with any proposals for their protection or to mitigate adverse effects.

Other Material Planning Considerations

22. The Lincolnshire Local Transport Plan (LTP) outlines the key policies and programmes for transport, together with a set of targets against which to monitor progress. The first LTP (LTP1) covered a five year period (i.e. 2000 to 2005) and this was later updated and superseded by the second LTP (LTP2) which covered the period 2006/7 to 2010/11). Local Authorities have the freedom to decide for themselves how many years future LTPs should cover, including the ability to set different time spans for the strategy and implementation plan elements. Due to the uncertainty around national transport policy and funding following the change in Government in 2010, a 'light touch' approach has therefore been taken for the 3rd LTP (LTP3). LTP3 therefore covers just two years (2011/12 and 2012/13) and simply rolls forward the strategies and policies of LTP2 and summarises the strategies pursued during the LTP2 period and progress made to date.

LTP3 continues to support the development of the Lincoln Eastern Bypass which is recognised as a key component to creating a north-south route around the city centre, removing through traffic (most notably on the A15) and freeing up space to 'lock in' the benefit and enable the delivery of other sustainable travel elements of the strategy within the city centre (e.g. increased opportunities for improvements for buses, walking and cycling and improving air quality within the declared Air Quality Management Area).

LTP3 acknowledges that planning permission was secured in October 2010 for a dual carriageway scheme and states that discussions are continuing with the Government and landowners of potential urban extensions along the route regarding possible funding contributions.

Results of Consultation and Publicity

23. (a) Local County Council Members, Councillors N Jackson (Lincoln Park), R Renshaw (Lincoln East), M Overton (Branston and Navenby), J Brockway (Nettleham and Saxilby), C Oxby (Heighington and Washingborough), C A Talbot (Bracebridge Heath and Waddington) – were notified of the application on 12 February 2013 but no comments had been received. The new County Council Councillor N. Murray (Lincoln Glebe) was notified of the application on 9 May 2013 but no comments/response had been received at the time of writing this report. The former County Council Councillor Mrs Mathers made no comments on the application.
- (b) Washingborough Parish Council – has made the following comments (summarised):
- welcome the development and would like to a speedy start and completion of the works;
 - concerns raised regarding the amount of surface water that would be channelled down to the catchment ponds close the B1190 Washingborough Road and its dispersal;
 - clarification sought regarding what the area identified as ‘proposed flood compensation area’ constitutes;
 - should finances permit consideration should be given to incorporating a crawler lane along the section heading south from Washingborough Road. The carriageway is at its lowest point here and so would help to alleviate possible congestion;
 - the size of bridges should ensure they cater for a dual carriageway as the most effective solution in anticipation of future upgrading of the bypass;
 - concerns raised over the increased traffic travelling between Heighington and the bypass through Washingborough.
- (c) Greetwell Parish Council – comment that the bypass should be a dual carriageway although accept that funding constraints are the reason for it only being a single carriageway.

The Parish Council were re-consulted again on 29 April 2013 following the revisions to the proposed layout and arrangement of the hammerhead junction at Hawthorn Road. At the time of writing this report no further comments had been received.

- (d) Environmental Health Officer (City of Lincoln Council) – has made a number of detailed comments in respect of contaminated land, air quality and noise (including vibration). A summary of their comments is set out below.
- Contaminated Land – the development crosses into the City of Lincoln’s boundary in an area where, due to past and current activities, there is the potential for contamination to be present.

Therefore it is recommended that planning conditions be attached to any permission granted to ensure that any potential for contamination is correctly assessed and dealt with accordingly.

- Air Quality – the air quality assessment contained within the Environmental Statement (ES) uses appropriate methodologies and reasonable criteria for determining the significance of any impacts both from the construction and operational phases of the development. The ES recognises that the City of Lincoln Council has declared two Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) due to the likely exceedence of air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulate matter (PM₁₀) and a number of the receptor locations assessed within the ES fall within either one or both of the AQMAs. The ES also assesses potential impacts at locations close to the proposed route of the bypass as well as roads throughout the City where traffic flows are likely to change significantly.

In terms of the construction phase, the greatest potential impact is considered to be that from dust arising from the site operations and therefore, in line with the recommendations of the ES, the EHO recommends that appropriate conditions be imposed to ensure that effective mitigation measures and practices are implemented as part of the development (e.g. via the submission and approval of a Construction Management Plan).

In terms of the operational phase, the bypass would appear to have a negligible impact on levels of NO₂ and PM₁₀ at the majority of the receptor locations within the City of Lincoln boundary. There will, however, be some receptor locations, most notably along the route of the A15 through the city, that are predicted to see a moderate beneficial change for NO₂ and a substantial beneficial change for PM₁₀. One receptor is predicted to be subjected to an increase in number of days the levels of PM₁₀ exceed the 24 hour mean objective value, but would still meet the air quality objective. The City of Lincoln Council has a duty to prepare Air Quality Action Plans to identify practical measures to reduce pollution within the AQMAs and the Action Plan prepared by the City Council identifies the Lincoln Eastern Bypass as a key measure in achieving the air quality objectives for both these pollutants and therefore supports the implementation of the proposed scheme on air quality grounds.

Consequently, subject to the County Planning Authority being satisfied that the traffic flow data used in the air quality assessment is reasonable and acceptable, the EHO confirms that they have no objections to the development from an air quality perspective.

- Noise (including vibration) – the ES acknowledges that there will potentially be some significant impacts from noise and vibration during the construction phase. However, as the construction

methods have yet to be determined, in line with the recommendations of the ES, the EHO recommends that appropriate conditions be imposed to ensure that effective mitigation measures and practices are implemented as part of the development (e.g. via the submission and approval of a Construction Management Plan)

In terms of the operational phases, there would not appear to be any significant adverse impact for the majority of the identified receptors/locations both in the short and long term. However, there are a small number of properties which could be subject to significant increased noise levels and to mitigate and minimise such impacts it is proposed to use low noise surfacing along parts of the bypass route.

Consequently, subject to the imposition of conditions to secure details of the noise mitigation measures (including details of the areas where low noise surfacing is to be laid as part of the bypass route), the EHO confirms that they have no objections to the development from a noise and vibration perspective.

- (e) Environment Agency – has no objection to the development but has recommended that a number of planning conditions be imposed on any permission granted. These conditions would cover matters including the submission of details for the proposed flood compensation area, surface water drainage scheme and conditions to ensure that any potential for contamination is correctly assessed and dealt with accordingly.

A number of Informative comments have also been provided which could be included/attached to any permission granted.

- (f) Highways Agency – no objection as the bypass is not expected to have a material impact on their closest strategic route (i.e. the A46).
- (g) English Heritage (EH) - the proposed bypass development affects the physical preservation and setting of numerous designated and non-designated heritage assets. Lincoln is an exceptional city in terms of quantity, quality, variety and visibility of its heritage assets and their interrelationships and the views offered to and from key locations within the city, such as the Castle, Cathedral and Bishop's Palace are important to their individual significance and to the character of the city as a whole.

The present application proposes a single carriageway road, as opposed to the previously consented scheme for a dual carriageway, and is along the same alignment as that of the original scheme. It is also noted that the schemes design has been 'future-proofed' in relation to the width of bridges and other infrastructure, to allow for future conversion to a dual carriageway.

Having considered the application, EH have confirmed they do not object to this revised bypass development subject to appropriate mitigation being secured. They recommend that this application is determined in accordance with Government guidance, local plan policies and with the benefit of any further necessary local conservation advice. In terms of the proposed mitigation, EH request that specific details of this should be carefully conditioned and would also welcome the opportunity to advise further on these (in particular the matters of archaeology and landscaping). Appropriate curation of further historic landscape survey work, archaeological finds and historic building recording, should also be ensured under condition to provide a permanent and accessible record to this information.

(h) Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (LWT) – at the time of writing this report LWT has objected to the application. A summary of their comments and reasons for their objection is as follows:

- the proposals are contrary to the principles of the NPPF. There would be a loss of habitat within the Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI and other Local Wildlife Sites which are designated due to their nature conservation importance. Semi-natural habitats would also be lost, some of which are UK and Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitats. Although replacement habitats are proposed to be created as part of the scheme, the application (unlike the scheme approved in 2010) does not quantify the habitats to be lost or those gained through ecological enhancements. The bypass could make a positive contribution to providing an ecologically functioning corridor but not enough emphasis has been given to the 'net gain' principle of the NPPF. If it were to be demonstrated that there would be a net biodiversity gains as a result of the development then LWT would reconsider its objection;
- strongly recommend that the realignment of the road be considered so as to avoid Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI, Greetwell Wood SNCI and Witham Corridor LWS. If realignment is not possible then mitigation measures should be secured as part of this development. These should include the creation of the same quantities and types of habitats as those previously proposed for the 2010 scheme and the translocation of important flora species found within the development footprint. LWT would reconsider its objection if it can be confirmed that these same mitigation measures would be incorporated into this scheme as the current submission is not clear;
- the ES recommends that further great crested newt surveys be carried out but these have not been conducted. It is important that these be carried out and appropriate mitigation measures followed if necessary;

- there would be negative impacts on bats and it is recommend that post-construction monitoring is carried out. If significant impact is evident then further mitigation or compensation would be required;
- the bypass would result in the direct land-take of parts of a number of Local Wildlife Sites. LWT do not agree that the residual impact of the development on Local Wildlife Sites would be 'negligible'.
- LWT also include a number of suggestions and recommendations regarding potential ecological enhancements or measures that could be incorporated into the scheme to increase the biodiversity gains and to compensate for the habitats lost as a result of the development (e.g. wetland, calcareous grassland)

Overall, LWT comment that they would be prepared to reconsider their objection if further information is submitted to demonstrate that adverse impacts of Local Wildlife Sites would be adequately mitigated and compensated for and that the scheme would result in a net gain in biodiversity as promoted by the NPPF.

On 17 May 2013 the applicant submitted some further information which seeks to address the concerns and queries raised by LWT (and Natural England). A summary of this response and proposed means of addressing/resolving the concerns/issues raised is as follows:

- Proposed Route: the route corridor has been conserved in planning policy and planning permission has already previously been granted for a dual carriageway scheme that potentially could lead to a greater ecological impact. Concerns regarding the impact on Greetwell Quarry have been addressed (see below) and therefore the applicant does not consider that there can be any criticism in principle to route selection.
- Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI: the applicant has met with Natural England and discussed draft concepts showing how public viewing could be provided to the quarry faces of the Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI. It was agreed that no further details needed to be submitted at this stage, and that such measures could be incorporated into a conditioned mitigation strategy. It was agreed that such a condition need not be discharged in the preconstruction phase and that the mitigation measures should reasonably be completed by scheme opening;
- Crested Newts: further great crested newt surveys have been carried out (May 2013) and that these have demonstrated that there are no great crested newts within 500m of the proposed development site. The applicant therefore states that they believe the results of the recent surveys provide convincing evidence that no subsequent surveys would be necessary. Although the results of the survey are cited a copy of the actual survey and its findings have not yet been made available;
- Bats: because it is possible that bats may occasionally roost within crevices at Greetwell Quarry SSSI an ecological clerk of

works would be employed as part of the construction team (who would be an experienced ecologist who holds a bat licence). Particular consideration would be given within the construction method statement to measures that could be implemented to minimise any risk to bats that may incidentally be present in habitats affected during construction works. In this way, the applicant does not consider there would be a residual negative impact on bats and in promoting the landscape and biodiversity proposals, consideration will be given to designs that would promote bat foraging corridors;

- Habitat Loss/Creation: a balance sheet setting out, in indicative terms, areas of BAP habitat types that would be removed by construction of the proposals, and the areas of new habitat types that would be provided within the landscaping design has now been provided. The sheet shows a potential for a gain in species-rich habitat area following completion of the proposals and include:

Woodland - a net gain of 34,835m²;

Scrub - a net gain of 14,317m²;

Wetland – a net gain of 1990m²;

Grassland (improved and semi-improved) – a net gain of 44,625m²;

Hedgerow – a net gain of 3,583m².

The detailed design of planting measures has not yet been fully specified although this could be secured by way of a pre-commencement planning condition. Those details would ensure that biodiversity benefits are maximised where possible and also contain an appropriate management regime for the created habitats;

- Calcareous Grassland and Wetland: the applicant fully recognises the importance of lowland calcareous grassland and will include, where practicable, significant areas of such grassland in the landscape and biodiversity proposals. These measures may include consideration of extending such grassland over the Witham Valley bridge corridor, dependent on practical considerations and near to the proposed Sleaford Road/A15 roundabout replacing that which would be lost around Bloxholm Lane.

Wetland habitats will be created in respect of balancing ponds and details of these would be agreed by a condition. Clearly, close liaison with the Environment Agency on those measures will be needed also to ensure that they cater not only as flood management structures, but also, where practicable, new wetland habitats.

- Giant Bellflower: a survey is planned to be undertaken during later summer when this species is in flower, to identify and mark the locations of any stands that are present. These stands may

then be translocated during an appropriate time of year to locations in suitable habitats, subject to landowner agreement, where they would not be affected by works, so as to retain and enhance specimens and genetic reserves;

The additional information has been forwarded onto LWT for comment but no response had been received at the time of writing this report. Any response received will therefore be reported to the Planning and Regulation Committee before the application is debated.

- (i) Natural England (NE) – initially objected to the development as they considered insufficient information had been provided to enable the full impacts of the development on the Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI to be adequately understood and assessed. NE therefore requested that further information be provided to confirm/include:

- details of the construction design for the bypass with plans illustrating the level and exact point of impact on the SSSI;
- how this impact would be mitigated and compensated for, and;
- where access to the limestone face would be provided and what measures will be taken to conserve existing geological feature.

NE also commented that further investigations/surveys should be carried out to determine the presence/absence of Great Crested Newts within the development footprint so that any specific mitigation measures considered necessary to off-set any impact can be identified.

As outlined previously in this report, following a meeting with NE, the applicant submitted some further information (received 17 May 2013) which seeks to address the concerns and queries raised by LWT and NE. Having now reviewed this information NE has confirmed they have no objection to the development subject to conditions which would require further details to be submitted for the written approval of the County Planning Authority relating to the proposed works to be carried out within the Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI (e.g. a method statement including detailed plans and timetable of works) and details relating to a means of access between the bypass and quarry floor of the Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI.

With regard the Great Crested Newt surveys, NE note that the applicant has indicated that the recent surveys found no evidence of newts in the development footprint, however, a copy of this report and its findings have not yet been made available. Therefore before this application is determined NE has advised that a copy of this survey should be submitted and made available to the County Planning Authority so that its findings can be verified.

- (j) Network Rail – no objection to the development but has made a number of comments on the considerations and issues that would need to be taken into account to ensure that the development does not impact upon the safety, operational needs or integrity of railway infrastructure. Network Rail advise that formal discussions and agreements would need to be made between the County Council and Network Rail before works could commence on site and these formal agreements would cover a range of issues and considerations which are not necessarily matters that are relevant or appropriate to be secured by the planning process (e.g. safe use of equipment and plant in the vicinity of railway infrastructure). However, matters such as drainage, boundary fencing and barriers and details of landscaping, lighting and method statements (including bridge design and construction plans) should be subject of planning conditions should permission be granted (similar to the scheme approved in 2010).
- (k) Canal and River Trust (formerly British Waterways) – no objections subject to the imposition of suitably worded conditions which would require details of the proposed bridges and their finishes to be submitted for further approval and the implementation of a Construction Management Plan which would ensure the mitigation measures (as proposed within the application) are secured so as to mitigate/prevent the pollution of watercourses during the development.
- (l) Western Power Distribution – have no objections but confirm they own apparatus within close proximity to the development which does require 24 hour access. It is stated that separate notification therefore needs to be served on Western Power prior to any works taking place within the vicinity of their apparatus and information and advice on who to contact has been provided. It is considered that this advice/information could be appropriately handled by way of an Informative should permission be granted.
- (m) Historic Environment Team (Lincolnshire County Council) – has confirmed that, similar to the development approved in 2010, they recommend that suitable archaeological conditions be imposed. These should include a requirement for a detailed specification to be agreed with the County Planning Authority which is based upon the approved mitigation strategy (as included in the ES) and which would also detail the evaluation and mitigation measures to be adopted for any newly discovered sites/features falling within the development footprint. Such a condition would ensure that satisfactory arrangements are made for the investigation, retrieval and recording of all archaeological remains on the site.
- (n) Lincolnshire County Council Highways (Development Control) – has stated that as the application has been approved by the Head of Technical Services and has been through the relevant design/audit processes, the Divisional Highways Office wishes to make no observations on this major County Council scheme.

The following bodies/groups were consulted/notified of the proposals on 12 February 2013 but no comments had been received at the time of writing this report. Any comments/responses received after the publishing of this report will therefore be reported to the Planning and Regulation Committee before the application is debated.

Nettleham Parish Council
Canwick Parish Council
Bracebridge Heath Parish Council
Branston Mere Parish Council
Environmental Health Officer (North Kesteven District Council)
Environmental Health Officer (West Lindsey District Council)
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)
Lincolnshire Fieldpaths Association
Ramblers Association (Lincoln Area)
Sustrans
Witham First Internal Drainage Board (1st IDB)
Witham Third Internal Drainage Board (3rd IDB)
Lincolnshire Biodiversity Partnership
Ministry of Defence (MOD)
Cycle Lincs/Transition
Vehicle Operator & Services Agency (VOSA)
Railway Paths Ltd
Mid Lincs Local Countryside Access Forum
South Lincs & Rutland Local Countryside Access Forum
Greater Lincolnshire Local Enterprise Partnership
Commission for Architecture & the Built Environment (CABE)
Lincolnshire County Council Public Rights of Way (PRoW)
Lincolnshire County Council Arboriculture Officer
Anglian Water Ltd

24. The application has been publicised by site and press notice (Lincolnshire Echo on 28 February 2013) and has been advertised as a departure from the development plan as the proposed route of the bypass south of Washingborough Road differs from that which is identified and safeguarded in the North Kesteven Local Plan 2007. In addition to these notices, local residents living close to the proposed bypass route have been individually notified by letter and all landowners and agricultural tenants with land affected by the bypass route have been notified of the application.

Three representations have been received from residents living close to the proposed bypass route which raise concerns and objections to the development. The comments/issues raised in these representations are set out below (summarised):

- the proposed bypass is too close to residential properties situated within the new housing development to the north-east of Lincoln;
- the alignment of the bypass south of the Wragby Road (A15/A158) roundabout should be positioned more centrally so as to provide a greater

buffer between the bypass and residential properties. This would also give more scope for appropriate landscaping on both sides of the project and offer some protection to properties close by;

- soundproofing measures should be a major consideration as part of the development. The existing landscaping bund which runs alongside the eastern boundary of the housing development is small and sparsely planted with deciduous trees that prove useless as a barrier during the winter months;
- any lighting proposed should not be too close to dwellings;
- the footpath running alongside the bypass should have some form of security fencing in order to restrict access to properties which are near to the bypass thus improving neighbourhood safety and reducing the opportunities for crime (e.g. burglars using the footpath as an easy access/escape route);
- concerns regarding increased noise and disruption during the construction period. A contact for on-going communication with residents should be provided to help any concerns and issues to be raised and addressed during this period;
- concerns regarding impact on property values and questions regarding possible compensation;
- as only a single carriageway the bypass, like the rest of the relief roads around Lincoln, will cause congestion rather than relieve it;
- the money should be spent on upgrading the A15 between Lincoln and Scunthorpe. This road is a death trap;
- this proposal is a waste of taxpayers' money;
- the proposed bypass route is too close to Branston village as there would be significant noise pollution to existing residents on Lincoln Road (B1188). The bypass route should be reconsidered so that it passes about halfway between Canwick/Bracebridge Heath and the northern edge of Branston village. The land between the village and the bypass should be left as open land as should the land to the west of the bypass route (i.e. towards Lincoln) and should not be developed for housing. Branston must not be joined to Lincoln by a continuous sprawl of housing.

The Cyclist Touring Club (Lincolnshire) has objected to the revised proposals and reiterate the concerns and objections which were made in relation to the previous dual bypass scheme. A summary of the objections and issues in relation to both schemes are as follows:

- the bypass would cut off Lincoln City from its sub-urban villages and the open countryside beyond except for those who use motor vehicles;
- the proposed means of crossing the new bypass and the radial roads serving it are inconvenient and inadequate. The informal crossings at roundabouts (e.g. drop kerbs and markings) are not safe and suitable for a fast dual carriageway – Toucan crossings are the only safe and convenient option for cyclists and pedestrians (especially younger and older ones) and so these should be provided;
- the Sustrans route along the River Witham is the only safe cycle route into Lincoln City and its closure during the proposed construction works

would put walkers and cyclists in danger unless a safe temporary route is provided;

- the cycleway/footpath proposed alongside the route of the bypass is welcomed but the environmental and health benefits for users are overplayed as users would be subject to noise and fumes from traffic;
- the bypass does not represent a sustainable solution to Lincoln's congestion/pollution problems;
- suggested future housing and other developments along the route would only add to Lincoln's problems and negate any benefit to motorists that may arise from the bypass.

District Council's Observations

25. North Kesteven District Council – has no objection to the proposal but the Members of NKDC's Planning Committee would like the following comments and issues to be noted and taken into account in the determination of the application:

- Drainage: there are catchment ponds near to the B1190 junction and these, along with other features, must be effective to deal with the surface water drainage from the bypass and to mitigate any risk of flooding, particularly in and around Washingborough;
- Traffic Flow and Existing Highway Network: concerns that awkward movements on the existing highway network may impact adversely on Bracebridge Heath particularly with regard to the difficulty of manoeuvring heavy lorry traffic in the village between the A15 and A607 junction. Careful signage is therefore requested to discourage this flow and manoeuvring;
- Concerns also expressed regarding the potential for increased rat running through Waddington to Hykeham;
- Noise Attenuation: it is important that there are effective noise attenuation features between the proposed bypass and Bracebridge Heath and these should be retained as part of the scheme whether these be mounding and/or acoustic fencing;
- Climate Change: some questions/concerns regarding the longer term climate change benefits arising from this development (as claimed by the applicant) given the proposed increase in traffic use;
- Footpath/cycleway link: the Council supports and encourages the improvements proposed both around the new junction and routes leading towards the village of Branston which would facilitate cycling between Branston village and Lincoln.

West Lindsey District Council – support the proposal and raise no objection.

City of Lincoln Council – has no objection to the proposals.

Conclusions

26. This is a major proposal for the construction of a 7.5km long single carriageway bypass linking the existing northern relief road at the junction of

the A15 and A158 (Wragby Road) to the A15 (Sleaford Road) south of Bracebridge Heath. The planning application raises important policy and environmental issues which are considered below.

Need

27. The LEB is identified as a key component of delivering the Lincoln Transport Strategy (LTS) which is a multi-modal transport strategy aimed at delivering a set of prioritised improvements in transport infrastructure up to and beyond 2026. The 3rd Local Transport Plan (LTP3) continues to support the provision of the LEB which has (and continues to be) identified as being the county's priority major scheme for improving the overall movement of vehicular trips on the highway network.
28. Whilst objections have been received which suggest that alternatives to the LEB should be implemented such as widening other existing routes and increasing facilities for non-motorised transport, it is recognised that the LEB is only one element/project of the wider LTS and its construction would not prevent or negate the commitments that have been made to securing and delivering the other elements of the LTS. Whilst key benefits of the LEB would be to deliver improvements in road infrastructure and help to relieve congestion within the city, it would also improve the pedestrian and cycle network through the provision of a new dedicated cycleway/footpath along its entire length and provide links to existing facilities in the area. Therefore, despite the comments and objections received including those from the Cyclist Touring Club (Lincolnshire), the LEB would not adversely affect or jeopardise the delivery of improvements for other non-motorised modes of transport as promoted by the LTS and which are set out in LTP3.

Water Environment and Flood Risk

29. The NPPF, CLLP Policy 46B, WLLP Policies NBE14 and NBE15 and NKLP Policies C10 and C14 all seek to ensure development does not impede the risk or flow of flood water or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and that development proposals include measures to safely manage surface water run-off derived from them. In addition WLLP Policy NBE16 seeks to restrict the culverting of existing watercourses unless it is necessary to provide access across the watercourse.
30. The ES contains a detailed assessment of the potential impacts of the development on the water environment including surface waters, groundwater and flood risk. The assessment includes a Flood Risk Assessment which assesses the potential risks of flooding to and from the development and identifies the measures to be taken to mitigate and manage any risks arising from the development. The application also identifies the measures to be adopted to manage surface waters derived from the bypass and to protect groundwaters during both the construction and operational phases. Such measures include the provision of compensatory flood storage areas, construction of a dedicated drainage system to manage surface waters derived from the bypass, carrying out of

all construction works in accordance with best practice standards and culverting of watercourses which currently cross the proposed alignment of the bypass.

31. At the time of writing this report comments/responses from the Internal Drainage Boards had not been received, however, the Environment Agency have confirmed that they have no objections to the development subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions to ensure that the mitigation measures that have been identified as part of the development are secured. These would include details of the proposed flood compensation areas and therefore address the concerns and request made by Washingborough Parish Council for such details to be further assessed. Consequently, it is considered that subject to the imposition of the same or similar conditions to those imposed on the previous scheme approved in 2010, the potential impacts of the development on the water environment can be satisfactorily addressed and/or managed so as not to give rise to any significant adverse impacts and therefore would not conflict with the objectives or requirements of the relevant above cited policies.

Heritage Assets (inc. Archaeology, Listed and Historic Buildings, etc)

32. The NPPF and NKLP Policies HE1, HE2 and H3 seek to ensure that the impacts of development proposals on heritage assets are assessed and appropriate mitigation measures put forward. The proposed single carriageway LEB sits within broadly the same development footprint as that which was approved in 2010 and therefore its route continues to directly avoid impacting upon any significant sites of interest (e.g. Scheduled Ancient Monuments). Similar to the development approved in 2010, the ES contains a detailed evaluation and assessment of the potential impacts of the revised scheme and whilst there would be some damage to archaeological deposits/sites within the development footprint, mitigation measures have been proposed which seek to address and minimise these impacts.
33. No objections have been received from English Heritage, the relevant District Council's or the Historic Environment Team in relation to this revised development. However, consultees have requested that suitable planning conditions be imposed to ensure that the mitigation measures proposed to be implemented as part of the development are secured and/or that further details of these are required to be submitted for further approval. Such conditions would cover matters including the need to submit and approve a written scheme of investigation relating to the proposed archaeological works; details relating to the further historic landscape survey and relating to the survey and recording methods for historic railway bridge that would be demolished as part of the development. Details would also be required relating to the landscaping proposals and design and finishes of the proposed bridges. Such conditions reflect those which were imposed on the permission granted in 2010 and the re-imposition of similar conditions would provide an opportunity for the County Planning Authority to ensure that such details adequately take into account and address some of the comments

and issues raised by those interested bodies/organisations, in particular the Historic Environment Team and English Heritage. These conditions would also ensure that the necessary excavation works and recording of features encountered during the works are carried out in an acceptable manner and would satisfactorily address the impacts of the development on heritage assets therefore not conflict with the objectives or purpose of the relevant cited paragraphs contained within the NPPF or NKLP Policies HE1, HE2 and HE3.

Nature Conservation

34. The NPPF and CCLP Policies 44A and 44C, WLLP Policies NBE11, NBE12 and NBE13 and NKLP LW4, LW6, LW7 and LW8 all seek to protect sites of nature conservation interest (including SSSI's and locally designated sites) and local wildlife and protected species from inappropriate development.
35. The proposed single carriageway LEB sits within broadly the same development footprint as that which was approved in 2010. As a result, like the scheme approved in 2010, the development would result in the inevitable loss and severance of a number of different habitats which support a range of flora and fauna. Its alignment would also have impacts upon nationally and locally designated sites of nature conservation importance, the most significant of which being the Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI. The ES submitted in support of this application contains an assessment of the potential impacts of the revised bypass and identifies the mitigation measures that would be incorporated as part of the development to minimise, off-set and compensate for them. The ES concludes that following the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures (outlined earlier in this report) the significance of the pre-mitigation adverse impacts would be reduced. However, due to the nature of the development it is accepted that some minor adverse impacts would remain even with the proposed mitigation measures in place (e.g. impact on the flightlines of barn owls and bats, loss and reduction of foraging habitat, etc).
36. Despite the similarities between this revised development and that approved in 2010, at the time of writing this report, Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (LWT) maintains their objection to the proposal. The applicant has met with representatives of NE to discuss their concerns and has since submitted a response and some additional information which seeks to clarify and address LWTs and NEs concerns. An outline and summary of this information has already been detailed in this report but in essence confirms that measures would be incorporated into the development to address some of the more detailed concerns, in particular regarding access arrangements to the retained faces of the SSSI, details of landscaping proposals, details relating to the creation of wetlands and lowland calcareous grassland, etc. The applicant has suggested that details of these matters could be appropriately secured and discussed further through the use of planning conditions.

37. NE has subsequently withdrawn their objection to the development, however, no response has yet been received from LWT. Although the further information submitted by the applicant is expected to satisfy and address their concerns and objections, at the time of writing this report they had not responded or confirmed that their objection can be formally withdrawn. Therefore in the event that LWT have not formally withdrawn their objection before this application is debated, and should the Planning and Regulation Committee be minded to approve the application, then it is recommended that provided any representation received from LWT, which in the view of the Executive Director in consultation with the Chairman does not warrant further consideration of the application, the Executive Director be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out within this report plus any additional conditions considered appropriate based on the advice or comments from LWT. Subject to such conditions, it can be concluded that appropriate provision has been made to minimise, mitigate and compensate for the impacts arising from the development and these would help to reduce the significance of the impacts of the development to an acceptable level. Therefore the development would not be contrary to the general principles of the development plan policies identified above.

Landscape and Visual Impact

38. A number of policies seek to protect the open countryside, landscape character and visual amenity of the local landscape from inappropriate forms of development (e.g. WLLP Policies STRAT1, STRAT3, NBE10 and NKLP Policies C2, LW1, LW2 and LW3). In addition, CLLP Policy 55 seeks to restrict development which would obstruct views of the historic hilltop city and/or Lincoln Edge and Witham Gap and specific reference is made to the line of the eastern bypass where it crosses the floor of the Witham Gap.
39. The ES contains a detailed consideration of the impacts of the LEB on the landscape and visual amenity of the area. Like the approved 2010 dual carriageway scheme (ref: L/0170/10), due to the nature of the development it is accepted that the bypass would give rise to inevitable visual impacts on the local landscape and the most adverse of these would be on long distant views in and out of Lincoln. Although the current proposal is only for a single carriageway scheme the development footprint is broadly the same as that for the scheme approved in 2010 and elements of this current scheme have also been 'future-proofed' so as to allow for any potential future widening. As a result, a range of mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design and layout of the bypass as well as measures proposed such as landscaping and planting which (once mature) would help to integrate the development into the local landscape. Street lighting along the route is also proposed to only be restricted to those areas where it is considered necessary for highway safety reasons (e.g. at all junctions and along one section of the route) and this approach aims to ensure that there is a reasonable balance between the need to maintain highway safety whilst protecting the visual amenity of the area from excessive night-time light pollution.

40. English Heritage, The Canal and River Trust and Network Rail have all confirmed that in principle they have no objection to the development but have requested that conditions be imposed requiring details for certain aspects of the development to be submitted for the subsequent written approval of the County Planning Authority (e.g. landscaping, lighting, details of bridge structures). Such conditions were imposed on the previous 2010 scheme and the re-imposition of similar conditions on any permission granted for this revised bypass would also provide an opportunity for the County Planning Authority to ensure that such details adequately take into account and address some of the comments and issues raised by those bodies/organisations. For example, a condition relating to the proposed street lighting details would ensure that all lighting associated with the development is restricted to only that which is necessary for purpose and therefore minimise the impacts of glare and light spillage on the local landscape and amenity of local residents (in accordance with WLLP Policies NBE17 and NBE18 and NKLP Policy C22) and a landscaping condition would ensure that the proposals are appropriate in terms of character of the area and would, in time, help to integrate the development into the landscape (in accordance with the principles of CLLP Policy 46A, WLLP Policy CORE10 and NKLP Policy C19). Similarly, a planning condition requiring details of the final design of the bridges and their finishes to be submitted for formal approval would ensure that their design, scale and appearance are appropriate and would address the comments made by English Heritage and The Canal and River Trust and ensure that the development does not adversely detract or impact upon the historic city of Lincoln (in accordance with the principles of CLLP Policies 34 and 55 and WLLP Policy STRAT1).
41. Overall, whilst this revised proposal would, like the previous dual carriageway scheme, have an inevitable adverse impact on the visual appearance of the existing landscape the LEB is considered to be of strategic importance and, on balance, any adverse impacts on the local landscape are outweighed by the benefits the development would have in terms of contributing towards the continued and future economic success and growth of Lincoln and the reduction in congestion in the heart of the historic core of Lincoln. Whilst the long-term visual impacts cannot therefore be entirely mitigated or off-set it is considered that appropriate measures have been proposed which could be secured as part of the development which would, in time, help to minimise and reduce the significance of these impacts. Consequently, subject to the imposition of conditions similar to those imposed on the 2010 permission (ref: L/0170/10) the development is considered acceptable and would broadly not conflict with the relevant planning policies identified above.

Community and Residential Amenity

42. CLLP Policy 34, WLLP Policy STRAT1 and NKLP Policy C5 all seek to ensure that development proposals take into account the character, appearance and amenities of neighbouring land and do not adversely affect

the amenities of residents. WLLP Policy NBE17 reflect these general amenity protection policies and states that development proposals should not adversely affect or give rise to pollution by virtue of factors such as noise, dust, vibration, etc.

43. Objections have been received from local residents living close to the proposed LEB route. The main focus of these objections are on the potential impacts resulting from increased traffic noise, reduction in air quality and visual impacts from the development and street lighting. Again, as per the scheme approved in 2010, the ES supporting this revised proposal contains detailed assessments of the potential impacts of the LEB on all of the factors identified including noise and vibration, air quality, landscape and visual impact, etc. In all cases the ES identifies the magnitude of these impacts and, where appropriate, identifies the mitigation measures to be adopted to minimise and off-set these.
44. In respect of noise and vibration, potential impacts identified include those associated with both the construction phase and from traffic using the LEB once it is operational/in use. Noise impacts associated with the construction of the bypass are largely associated with the movement of plant and machinery and general construction activities (e.g. excavation, drilling, engine noise, etc). Although the exact construction methods have yet to be determined, the ES states that the impacts associated with these activities could be satisfactorily addressed through the adoption of good site management practices including regular maintenance of plant and machinery, programming of works so as to limit working to normal hours of working, etc. The EHO has raised no objection to the development but has recommended that further details of the measures to be adopted to minimise and reduce any noise be agreed as part of the 'Construction Environmental Management Plan' which could be secured by way of a condition. This approach would enable the County Planning Authority to ensure that appropriate measures are adopted to minimise the potential impacts on residents living close to the development.
45. In terms of the impacts associated with traffic noise, a number of measures have been proposed and incorporated into the design of the scheme including the use of low noise surfacing and construction of noise embankments along route. Due to the alignment of the bypass some sections of the route would also be situated in cuttings and therefore the associated embankments would help to provide noise screening along these sections. To ensure that some of these proposed mitigation measures are suitable and effective, conditions have therefore again been proposed which would require further details to be submitted for the approval of the County Planning Authority. These would include identifying the locations and specification of any low noise surfacing to be used along the bypass route and details of the locations and heights of the noise/landscape screening bunds.
46. In respect of concerns on the visual impacts of the development (including from street lighting) the measures proposed to mitigate and minimise these

have already been discussed (see 'Landscape and Visual Impacts' section above) and would be addressed through the carrying out of landscape planting, construction of screen embankments restricting street lighting to only those areas where it is necessary and use of directional lighting. Conditions have been recommended to secure the specific details of these matters and would be appropriate to satisfactorily address these concerns.

47. Finally, in respect of the potential impacts on air quality the ES has identified the potential risks and impacts associated with the LEB and again measures have been proposed to address these. In terms of dust, again good site management practices would be adopted to minimise the incidence and impacts of dust and could form part of the wider 'Construction Environmental Management Plan'. In terms of air quality, the predicted increases in pollutants arising from traffic on certain properties is assessed as being within acceptable levels and would not exceed the air quality objectives for the area. These impacts are therefore not considered significant and no specific mitigation measures are considered necessary.
48. In conclusion, whilst the concerns and objections of local residents are noted it is considered that appropriate mitigation measures (where feasible) can be adopted which would help to minimise the adverse impacts of the development to within acceptable standards and levels. Therefore, on balance, the development is considered not to be contrary to CLLP Policy 34, WLLP Policies STRAT1, NBE17 and NKLP Policy C5.

Impacts on Agriculture and Other Land-Uses

49. NKLP Policy C3 seeks to protect agricultural land and will not permit development of the 'best and most versatile' land unless there is no other suitable land available. The ES confirms that the majority of the route is over land which falls within the 'best and most versatile' classification. Whilst it is accepted that the scheme would result in the permanent loss of this quality agricultural land, the actual area lost only represents a relatively small proportion of that which is in agricultural use across the County as a whole. Therefore whilst the loss of this land is unfortunate, given the general location of the proposed LEB (e.g. along the eastern fringe of Lincoln) there is no alternative to the loss of 'best and most versatile land'. Furthermore it is considered that the wider benefits of the LEB scheme justify the loss of this land and whilst being contrary to the objectives of NKLP Policy C3, in this case this loss considered justified and acceptable.
50. In respect of future and existing development, the revised LEB route would not impact upon land lying to the east of Lincoln which could be developed in the future as an urban extension to the city which was supported by the former East Midlands Regional Plan. Whilst the East Midlands Regional Plan has been revoked, the expansion of Lincoln is to continue to be promoted and identified through the Central Lincolnshire Core Strategy. The Core Strategy will set out the future planning policy strategy for the central Lincoln area and is being developed as a partnership between the County, City of Lincoln, North Kesteven and West Lindsey District Councils.

Furthermore, the proposed route would also not adversely affect the existing and allocated sites for future development within Greetwell Quarry and land lying to the north of the quarry as identified in the adopted Local Plans (e.g. CLLP Policies 38E and 70 and WLLLP Policy STRAT10).

Need and Alternatives to the LEB

51. Objections received from local residents and the Cyclist Touring Club (Lincolnshire) suggest that alternatives to the bypass and/or its proposed route should be pursued in order to help reduce reliance on private car travel and deliver more sustainable transport options or to minimise the impacts of the route on residents or settlements such as Branston and Bracebridge Heath.
52. As highlighted earlier in this report, the LEB is a key component of delivering the Lincoln Transport Strategy (LTS) and the 3rd Local Transport Plan (LTP3) continues to support the development of the LEB as it would create a north-south route around the city centre, help to remove through traffic from the city (most notably on the A15) and free up space to enable the delivery of other sustainable travel elements of the strategy within the city centre (e.g. increased opportunities for improvements for buses, walking and cycling and improving air quality within the declared Air Quality Management Area). The County Council and its partners therefore still believe the LEB is fundamental to facilitating the continued and future success of Lincoln.
53. However, notwithstanding the above, it is accepted that the LEB is only one element/project of the wider LTS and its construction would not prevent or negate the commitments that have been made to securing and delivering the other elements of the LTS. In fact whilst key benefits of the LEB would be to deliver improvements in road infrastructure and help to relieve congestion within the city, it would also improve the pedestrian and cycle network through the provision of a new dedicated cycleway/footpath along its entire length and provide links to existing facilities in the area. Therefore, despite the comments and objections received, it is your Officer's view that the LEB would not adversely affect or jeopardise the delivery of improvements for other non-motorised modes of transport as promoted by the LTS and which are currently supported by LTP3 and which would continue to be promoted through future revisions of the LTP.

Safety

54. The Cyclist Touring Club (Lincolnshire) (CTC) has reiterated their previous concerns and objections regarding the proposed LEB. Whilst the CTC welcomes the provision of non-motorised user (NMU) facilities along the route of the LEB (i.e. bridges, footpaths and cyclepaths) a number of concerns have been raised regarding the specific nature of the proposed NMU facilities, in particular the crossing facilities proposed at the roundabout junctions to be constructed along the route. The CTC has again stated that more formalised and controlled arrangements should be installed such as toucan light crossings as these are considered to be safer and more

convenient to NMUs. The CTC has also requested that their previous concerns and comments regarding other elements/aspects of the scheme also continue to be taken into account. These include concerns previously raised in relation to the proposed bridges and underpasses to be installed as part of the LEB where it was stated that such facilities should be designed so that they are suitable for use by all NMUs (e.g. pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians) and therefore should have approaches which do not involve sharp radii or right angled turns so as to encourage their use and ensure good visibility and safety of users. Concerns were also previously raised regarding the potential impacts of the development on existing pedestrian/cycle routes within the area in particular the Sustrans route which runs along the River Witham.

55. In response to the comments regarding the provision of toucan crossings at the roundabout junctions, although a single carriageway road is now being proposed the scheme has been designed so that in the future it could be widened to provide a dual carriageway similar to that approved in 2010. Furthermore, given the anticipated high traffic flows and speed of vehicles that would be using the bypass (even as a single carriageway road) toucan crossing facilities are not considered suitable or safe for this type of road scheme and so consequently, rather than provide toucan or similar light controlled facilities at road intersections/junctions, this scheme proposes a combination of different crossing facilities including grade separated facilities (e.g. bridges) at Bloxholm Lane and Greetwell Road along with a dedicated underpass across the bypass at Lincoln Road. These would ensure that access across the route is still provided whilst maintaining the safety of both NMUs and motorists.
56. With regard the concerns raised in relation to the approaches to these grade separated facilities, like the scheme that approved in 2010, it is noted that the provision of gradual slopes to such facilities is not always possible due to the difference in levels that needs to be achieved and as larger areas of land would need to be taken in order accommodate such gradual approaches. Detailed information regarding the design of the proposed bridges and structures could be secured by way of planning conditions attached on any permission granted and such details could include the proposed approaches to these facilities. Such a condition would enable a full consideration and assessment of the suitability of such approaches to be given and ensure that the proposed NMU facilities proposed as part of this development are suitable to enable their use by all NMUs. This same approach was taken in relation to the dual carriageway scheme which was approved in 2010.
57. In respect of previous concerns over the potential impacts on the Sustrans route (and other existing public footpaths), it is accepted that there would be a need to temporarily close some of these routes during the construction works. The impacts, timings and length of any closures would be minimised as far as reasonably possible taking into account the construction methods, nature of the works proposed and the need to maintain public safety. Furthermore, where feasible, alternative routes would be provided for the

duration of any closures in order to minimise any adverse impacts on the amenity of users of these routes.

58. In conclusion, whilst the concerns of the CTC are noted, like the scheme approved in 2010, it is considered that, on balance, the development makes suitable provision both in terms of providing new opportunities and facilities for NMUs as well as providing links to existing facilities and therefore is in general accordance with the principles of CLLP Policy 5, WLLP Policies CRT9, SUS1 and SUS4 and NKLP Policies T4, RST2 and RST4.

Final Conclusions

59. The Lincoln Eastern Bypass (LEB) is a major highway scheme which is considered to be of strategic importance and would improve the effectiveness of the transport network in and around Lincoln. Although this development relates to the construction of a single carriageway road, like the dual carriageway scheme approved in 2010, this revised LEB would also help to remove traffic from the centre of Lincoln and therefore reduce congestion and traffic levels within the City to the benefit of local residents and the impacts on the city's heritage and historic core. The LEB would also have wider environmental and social benefits such as improving air quality in the city, reducing social exclusion by providing better links between communities, providing new and extended cycle and pedestrian facilities, as well as creating a more attractive living and working environment within the city. All of these would assist in creating improved investment conditions within the city resulting in future development and regeneration opportunities which would attract activities and people back into the urban area. The LEB is therefore not only an important infrastructure project but would also have wider economic, environmental and social benefits which would help to support the future economic success and growth of Lincoln.
60. The application has been assessed against adopted local development policies contained within the City of Lincoln Local Plan, West Lindsey Local Plan and North Kesteven Local Plan. Whilst part of the bypass route does not conform to that which has been identified and protected within the North Kesteven Local Plan it is, however, the same as that of the dual carriageway scheme which was granted planning permission in October 2010 which is a material consideration in the determination of this application. The alternative route proposed by both the scheme approved in 2010 and this revised proposal is, however, on balance, considered to be acceptable.
61. However, as discussed earlier in this report, Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (LWT) currently object to the development. Although further information has been provided by the applicant and forwarded to LWT which is understood will satisfy and address their concerns and objections, at the time of writing this report they have not responded or confirmed that their objection can be formally withdrawn. Therefore your Officers advise that should the Planning and Regulation Committee be minded to approve the application then it is recommended that provided any representation received from the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, which in the view of the Executive Director in

consultation with the Chairman do not warrant further consideration of the application, the Executive Director be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out within this report (and any additional conditions considered appropriate based on the advice or comments from the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust).

62. Subject to above and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified within the application and suitable planning conditions, it can be concluded that the development could be undertaken in a manner where the level of impact would be acceptable and would not significantly conflict with the wider objectives or development control policies contained within the Development Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that provided any representation received from the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, which in the view of the Executive Director in consultation with the Chairman do not warrant further consideration of the application, the Executive Director be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out within this report (and any additional conditions considered appropriate based on the advice or comments from the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust). It is recommended that:

- (A) This report (including appendices) forms part of the Council's Statement pursuant to Regulation 24 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 – which requires the Council to make available for public inspection at the District Council's offices specified information regarding the decision. Pursuant to Regulation 24(1)(c) the Council must make available for public inspection a statement which contains:
- the content of the decision and any conditions attached to it;
 - the main reasons and consideration on which the decision is based,
 - including, if relevant, information about the participation of the public;
 - a description, when necessary, of the main measures to avoid, reduce and if possible offset the major adverse effects of the development;
 - information recording the right to challenge the validity of the decision and the procedures for doing so.
- (B) Planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:
1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years of the date of this permission. Written notification of the date of commencement of development shall be sent to the County Planning Authority (CPA) within seven days of commencement.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the details contained in the application and in full

compliance with the mitigation measures identified and set out in the supporting Environmental Statement, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the CPA, or where modified by the conditions attached to this planning permission or by details subsequently approved pursuant to those conditions.

3. No development shall take place until a detailed landscaping scheme, including any proposed fencing, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA. The landscaping scheme shall include information on the species, numbers, spacing and positions of all grasses, trees, shrubs, hedgerows and bushes to be planted as part of the development and include details of the long term maintenance and aftercare proposals to ensure their success for a period of 10 years commencing from the date of completion of the development. Any plants which at any time during the development and/or 10 year aftercare period die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the CPA. In respect of fencing, details shall include the type, height, treatment/colour and position of any fencing to be erected as part of the development. The approved scheme shall thereafter be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
4. No development shall take place until details of the bunds for noise mitigation and landscaping to be constructed along the boundaries of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA. Such details shall include appropriate cross sections of the bunds and include details of the location, size and height of the bund as well as details of the proposed materials and method of construction. Following the construction of the bunds they shall be grass seeded, landscaped and maintained in accordance with the details approved pursuant to Condition 3. Thereafter the bunds shall be constructed and all works implemented and carried out in full accordance with the approved details and thereafter whilst ever the development subsists.
5. Unless minor variations are otherwise agreed in writing by the CPA, construction works which are audible at the site boundary shall only take place between 07:00 – 19:00 Monday to Friday, and 09:00 – 13:00 on Saturdays, and not at any time on Sundays, Public or Bank Holidays. Construction activities which are assessed as being inaudible at the site boundary (such as electrical work) may be undertaken outside of these times.
6. All vehicles, plant and machinery shall be maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specification at all times, and shall be fitted with and use effective silencers. Any breakdown or malfunction of silencing equipment or screening shall be treated as an emergency and should be dealt with immediately. Where a repair cannot be undertaken within a reasonable period, the equipment affected should be taken out of service.

7. (a) No development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation has been submitted to and approved by the County Planning Authority. This scheme should reflect the practices and mitigation measures to reduce or avoid impacts on archaeological deposits as set out in Chapter 12, Section 12.6 of the Environmental Statement and include the following items set out below and be in accordance with the archaeological brief supplied by the Lincolnshire County Council Historic Environment advisor on behalf of the County Planning Authority:
1. An assessment of significance and proposed mitigation strategy (i.e. preservation by record, preservation in situ or a mix of these elements);
 2. A methodology and timetable of site investigation and recording
 3. Provision for site analysis;
 4. Provision for publication and dissemination of analysis and records provision for archive deposition;
 5. Nomination of a competent person/organisation to undertake the work;
 6. The scheme to be in accordance with the Lincolnshire Archaeological Handbook.
- (b) The archaeological site work shall be undertaken only in full accordance with the approved written scheme. The applicant will notify the County Planning Authority of the intention to commence at least fourteen days before the start of archaeological work in order to facilitate adequate monitoring arrangements. No variation shall take place without prior consent of the County Planning Authority.
- (c) A copy of the final report will be submitted within three months of the work to the County Planning Authority for approval (or according to an agreed programme). The material and paper archive required as part of the written scheme of investigation shall be deposited with an appropriate archive in accordance with guidelines published in The Lincolnshire Archaeological Handbook.
8. (a) No development shall take place until details of the historic landscape survey referred to in Chapter 12, Paragraph 12.6.15 of the Environmental Statement have been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA. The submitted scheme shall provide for the recording of the identified Historic Landscapes affected by the development (as identified by the Drawing No.1030171-LEB-EIA-HER-003a contained within Section 12.7 (Volume 2) of the Environmental Statement) and should include measured survey of any field boundaries to be removed as well as photographic survey of the wider area and long views to and from the Historic Landscape Types. The historic landscape survey shall be carried out prior to any construction works taking place within the identified Historic Landscape areas, in full accordance with the approved scheme.

- (b) A copy of the final report relating to the above shall be submitted within three months of the work to the County Planning Authority for approval (or according to an agreed programme). The material and paper archive shall be deposited with an appropriate archive in accordance with guidelines published in The Lincolnshire Archaeological Handbook.

- 9.
 - (a) No development shall take place until details of a scheme of historic building recording relating to the Railway Underbridge (Site 220) as referred to in Chapter 12, Paragraph 12.6.14 of the Environmental Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA. The scheme shall provide a written and photographic record of the structure (as appropriate) and provide a permanent record of the structure in its current condition. The historic building recording works shall thereafter be implemented and carried out prior to the structures demolition, in full accordance with the approved scheme.

 - (b) A copy of the final report relating to the above shall be submitted within three months of the work to the County Planning Authority for approval (or according to an agreed programme). The material and paper archive shall be deposited with an appropriate archive in accordance with guidelines published in The Lincolnshire Archaeological Handbook.

- 10. No development shall take place until full details of all bridges, structures, underpasses, bridge wing walls, abutments and crossings (including temporary bridges across the River Witham during construction works) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA. Such details shall include information on the colours and treatment of all surfaces, finishes and textures associated with these elements (e.g. railings, wing walls, side walls of underpass) as well as exact clearance heights. The bridges, structures, underpasses, bridge wing walls, abutments and crossings shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

- 11. All floodlighting and external site lighting associated with the construction of the development hereby permitted shall be positioned and operated to minimise the potential nuisance of light spillage from the site.

- 12. Before the bypass hereby approved is brought into use details of all proposed lighting to be implemented as part of the development (including street lighting and that associated with the bridges, underpasses and other circulation areas, etc) shall be submitted for the approval of the CPA. Thereafter the lighting shall be implemented and carried out in full accordance with the approved details.

- 13. Should, during construction works, contamination not previously identified be found within the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the CPA) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted to and obtained written approval from the CPA for a remediation strategy detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.

14. No development shall take place until a method statement, detailed plan and timetable of works to mitigate the impacts of the development on the Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI have been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA. All works shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.
15. No development shall take place until details of the facilities to be constructed to provide public/pedestrian access to the quarry floor and retained exposures of the Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI have been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA. All works shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved details and the means of access completed at the date the bypass is open for traffic.
16. No development shall take place until a method statement, detailed plan and timetable of works to mitigate the impacts to bats, water voles and grass snakes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA. All works shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.
17. No earthworks, site clearance or ground disturbance works shall take place between March and September, inclusive unless otherwise agreed in writing with the CPA. If these works cannot be undertaken outside this time, they should be evaluated and checked for breeding birds by an appropriately qualified ecologist and if appropriate, an exclusion zone set up. No work shall be undertaken within the exclusion zone until birds and any dependent young have vacated the area.
18. No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision of surface water drainage, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA, in consultation with surface drainage authorities, including the Internal Drainage Boards and the Environment Agency. The scheme shall reflect the principles, mitigation measures and specification requirements as set out in Chapter 7, Section 7.6 of the Environmental Statement including the provision of level for level floodplain compensatory storage as indicated in the applications Flood Risk Assessment. The approved scheme shall be implemented and carried out before the development is completed and shall thereafter be maintained for the duration that the development hereby permitted subsists.
19. Any facilities for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The volume of the bunded compound shall be at least equivalent to the capacity of the tank plus 10%. If there is multiple tankage, the compound shall be at least equivalent to the capacity of the largest tank, or the capacity of interconnected tanks, plus 10%. All filling points, vents, gauges and site glasses must be located within the bund. The drainage system of the bund shall be sealed with no discharge to any watercourse, land or underground

strata. Associated pipework shall be located above ground and protected from accidental damage. All filling points and tank overflow pipe outlets shall be detailed to discharge downwards into the bund.

20. No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA. The Plan shall include details of the development which shall include but not necessarily be limited to the following:
- a) identify the locations of the contractor's temporary site storage areas/compounds including details of the number, size (including height) and location of contractors' temporary buildings;
 - b) the means of moving, storing and stacking all materials, plant and equipment around the site;
 - c) the measures to be adopted during all works to ensure that dust emissions are minimised (reflecting those practices and mitigation measures set out in Chapter 11, Section 11.6 of the Environmental Statement);
 - d) the measures to be adopted during all works to minimise the incidence and impacts of noise and vibration arising from the development (reflecting the practices and mitigation measures set out in Chapter 10, Section 10.6 of the Environmental Statement);
 - e) the measures to avoid the pollution and discharge of any substances, including surface water run-off, into controlled water during the construction and operation phases of the development (reflecting the practices and measures set out in Chapter 7, Section 7.6 of the Environmental Statement);
 - f) details of any wheel wash facility, use of water bowsers and any other measures necessary to ensure that vehicles do not leave the site in a condition whereby mud, clay or other deleterious materials are carried onto the public highway.

The approved plan shall thereafter be implemented and carried out in full accordance with the approved details.

21. No development shall take place until a detailed strategy and method statement for minimising the amount of construction waste resulting from the construction of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the CPA. The statement shall include details of the extent to which waste materials arising from construction activities will be reused on site and demonstrating that as far as reasonably practicable, maximum use is being made of these materials. If such reuse on site is not practicable, then details shall be given of the extent to which the waste material will be removed from the site for reuse, recycling, composting or disposal. All waste materials shall thereafter be reused, recycled or dealt with in strict accordance with the approved strategy and method statement.
22. No development shall take place until a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site and the methods proposed to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site has been submitted

to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

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

Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

23. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the County Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the County Planning Authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination will be dealt with and obtained written approval from the County Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.
24. No development shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority which confirms the specification, materials and sections or areas of the bypass route where low noise surfacing is to be used. As a minimum these sections or areas shall include those parts of the bypass which lie in proximity to Hawthorn Road, Bunkers Hill, Whitefriars Road, Greetwell Road and in proximity to and south of the village of Washingborough. All works shall thereafter be carried out in full accordance with the approved details including any future replacement or resurfacing works which affect those sections or areas of the bypass which are subject of the approved details.

Reasons for Granting Planning Permission

1. To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the details as contained in the application and the principles of the mitigation set out in the Environmental Statement in order to minimise the environmental effects of the development.
- 3 & 4 To minimise the impact of the development on the local landscape in the interests of visual amenity.
- 5, 6 & 24
To minimise the impacts of noise arising from the development, in the interests of amenity.
- 7 to 9 To ensure that satisfactory arrangements are made for the investigation, retrieval and recording of archaeological deposits within the site and to secure appropriate schemes for recording of the historic railway underbridge and historic landscape features as identified and proposed within the Environmental Statement.
10. To ensure that the final design, scale and appearance of the proposed structures are appropriate and would not adversely detract or impact upon the visual amenity of the area and views to and from the historic city centre. Such details would also ensure that adequate clearance is provided to allow safe and unrestricted access by users of the River Witham and to protect the bridge from defacement/vandalism as per the recommendations of British Waterways.
- 11 & 12
In the interests of visual amenity and to minimise the impacts of light pollution on the local landscape and adjoining land uses (e.g. railway infrastructure).
13. In accordance with the recommendations and advice of the Environment Agency and to ensure that appropriate remediation measures can be secured to protect controlled waters for any contaminated land which may be present within the site.
- 14 & 15
In accordance with the recommendations of Natural England and to minimise the impacts of the development on the SSSI and to mitigate for the loss of the SSSI by ensuring suitable access to the retained exposures of the SSSI is secured in the interest of nature conservation.
16. In accordance with the recommendations of Natural England so as to protect bats, water voles and grass snakes that have been identified as being affected by the development and to secure the mitigation measures for these species as set out in Section 10.7 of the Environmental Statement.

17. In the interests of safeguarding nesting birds that are protected by law.

18 & 19

To reflect the recommendations and conditions proposed by Environment Agency so as to prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

20. To ensure that the development does not give rise to adverse impacts by virtue of noise, dust and to protect water resources from pollution in the interests of the amenity of the area.

21. To minimise the amount of construction waste to be removed from site for final disposal.

22 & 23

To ensure that any unforeseen contamination encountered during development is dealt with in an appropriate manner and to prevent the pollution of controlled waters.

Reasons for Granting Planning Permission

The Lincoln Eastern Bypass (LEB) is a major highway scheme which is considered to be of strategic importance and would improve the effectiveness of the transport network in and around Lincoln. Although this development relates to the construction of a single carriageway road, like the dual carriageway scheme approved in 2010, this revised LEB would also help to remove traffic from the centre of Lincoln and therefore reduce congestion and traffic levels within the City to the benefit of local residents and the impacts on the city's heritage and historic core. The LEB would also have wider environmental and social benefits such as improving air quality in the city, reducing social exclusion by providing better links between communities, providing new and extended cycle and pedestrian facilities, as well as creating a more attractive living and working environment within the city. All of these would assist in creating improved investment conditions within the city resulting in future development and regeneration opportunities which would attract activities and people back into the urban area. The LEB is therefore not only an important infrastructure project but would also have wider economic, environmental and social benefits which would help to support the future economic success and growth of Lincoln.

Whilst the route of the bypass does not conform to that which has been identified and protected within the Development Plan it is the same as that which was previously approved in 2010 which was similarly considered to be acceptable in land use planning and environmental terms. Overall, it is considered that the development, subject to the implementation of the mitigation measures identified within the application and suitable planning conditions, can be undertaken in a manner where the level of impact would be acceptable and would not significantly

conflict with the wider objectives or development control policies contained within the Development Plan.

The County Planning Authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner by processing the application efficiently so as to prevent any unnecessary delay. This approach ensures the application is handled in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development and is consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Policies Referred To

National Planning Policy Framework – March 2012

City of Lincoln Local Plan 1998

- Policy 5 - Strategic Network of Cycleways, Footpaths and Bridleways
- Policy 14 - Strategic and Major Road Proposals
- Policy 38 - Design and Amenity Standards
- Policy 38E - Development adjacent to Greetwell Quarry
- Policy 44A - Sites of Special Scientific Interest or other Critical Natural Assets
- Policy 44C - Protected Species
- Policy 45A - Trees and Other Ecological and Landscape Features
- Policy 46A - Woodland and Other Major Planting Initiatives
- Policy 46B - Protecting the Water Environment
- Policy 55 - Long Views Into and Out of the City
- Policy 70 - Greetwell Quarry

West Lindsey Local Plan 2006

- Policy STRAT1 - Development Requiring Planning Permission
- Policy STRAT3 - Development in the Countryside
- Policy STRAT10 - Longer Term Development Options – Lincoln and Bardney
- Policy SUS1 - Development Proposals and Transport Choice
- Policy SUS4 - Cycle and Pedestrian Routes in Development Proposals
- Policy ECON13 - Lincoln Eastern Bypass
- Policy CORE10 - Open Space and Landscaping Proposals
- Policy CRT9 - Public Rights of Way affected by Development
- Policy NBE10 - Protection of Landscape Character
- Policy NBE11 - Sites of Special Scientific Interest and National Nature Reserves
- Policy NBE12 - Nature Conservation in Wildlife Corridors
- Policy NBE14 - Waste Water Disposal
- Policy NBE15 - Water Quality and Supply
- Policy NBE16 - Culverting Watercourses
- Policy NBE17 - Potentially Polluting Uses
- Policy NBE18 - Light Pollution

North Kesteven Local Plan 2007

Policy C2 - Development in the Countryside
Policy C3 - Agricultural Land Quality
Policy C5 - Effects on Amenities
Policy C7 - Comprehensive Development
Policy C10 - Flood Risk
Policy C11 - Pollution
Policy C14 - Surface Water Disposal
Policy C19 - Landscaping
Policy C22 - External Lighting Schemes
Policy T4 - Safety
Policy T7 - Lincoln Eastern Bypass
Policy RST2 - Public Rights of Way
Policy RST4 - Public Access to the Countryside
Policy LW1 - Landscape Conservation
Policy LW2 - Green Wedges
Policy LW3 - Visual Amenity Areas
Policy LW4 - Sites of Special Scientific Interest
Policy LW6 - County Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves
Policy LW7 - Features of Importance for Wildlife
Policy LW8 - Protected Species
Policies HE1 to HE3 - Protection of Features of Archaeological Interest

Informatives

Attention is drawn to:

- (1) The Informatives and advice set out in the Environment Agency's letter dated 4 March 2013.
- (2) The comments and advice set out in the email from Network Rail dated 5 March 2013.
- (3) The comments contained within the Canal and River Trust's letter dated 15 March 2013 in respect of the need to contact and obtain separate consent from the Trust prior to undertaking any works which affect their assets.
- (4) The validity of the grant of planning permission may be challenged by judicial review proceedings in the Administrative Court of the High Court. Such proceedings will be concerned with the legality of the decision rather than its merits. Proceedings may only be brought by a person with sufficient interest in the subject matter. Any proceedings should be brought promptly and within three months from the date of the planning permission. What is prompt will depend on all the circumstances of the particular case but promptness may require proceedings to be brought at some time before three months have expired.

Whilst the time limit may be extended if there is good reason to do so, such extensions of time are exceptional. Any person considering bringing

proceedings should therefore seek legal advice as soon as possible. The detailed procedural requirements are set out in the Civic Procedure Rules Part 54 of the Practice Directives for these rules.

Appendices

These are listed below and attached at the back of the report	
Appendix A	Committee Plan

Background Papers

The following background papers as defined in the Local Government Act 1972 were relied upon in the writing of this report.

Document title	Where the document can be viewed
Planning Application File L/0110/13 L/0170/10	Lincolnshire County Council, Planning, Witham Park House, Waterside South, Lincoln
National Planning Policy Framework – March 2012	Communities and Local Government Website www.communities.gov.uk
East Midland Regional Plan 2009	Lincolnshire County Council, Planning, Witham Park House, Waterside South, Lincoln
West Lindsey Local Plan (First Review) 2006	West Lindsey District Council website www.west-lindsey.gov.uk
City of Lincoln Local Plan 1998	City of Lincoln Council website www.lincoln.gov.uk
North Kesteven Local Plan 2007	North Kesteven District Council website www.n-kesteven.gov.uk
3 rd Lincolnshire Transport Local Plan	Lincolnshire County Council website www.lincolnshire.gov.uk

This report was written by Marc Willis, who can be contacted on 01522 782070 or dev_pcg@lincolnshire.gov.uk



← Site of Application

LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
 Reproduced from the 1996 Os Mapping with the permission
 of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office (C) Crown
 Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown
 Copyright and may lead to civil proceedings.
OS LICENCE 100025370

Location:
 In the Parishes of Lincoln, Greetwell,
 Canwick, Washingborough
 and Bracebridge Heath

Description:
 To construct a 7.5km long single carriageway bypass
 to the eastern side of Lincoln known as the Lincoln
 Eastern Bypass

Application No: L/0110/13
Scale: 1:40 000

Planning and Regulation Committee 10 June 2013