

To: Dean Watson, Principal Development Management Officer, Major Applications

From: Highway Development Services

Subject: PA/2025/254 – Hybrid planning permission comprising of outline, with all matters reserved for up to 550 dwellings, a local centre (use Class E), associated landscaping drainage and other infrastructure works. Full planning permission for the construction of a new vehicular access off the M181/A1077(M) roundabout, a pedestrian and cycle link to Scotter Road, a pumping station, earthworks and off-plot drainage, ecological and associated landscaping and infrastructure works

Date: 4th April 2025

Thank you for consulting with Highways on the above application, we have reviewed the information submitted and would offer the following comments:

Site access and link road

It is proposed that the site will be served by a single point of access taken from the M181 / A1077(M) roundabout. The main spine road will form part of an east – west link road, but a connection to Scotter Road is not proposed as part of this application.

As previously stated, our preference is for the east – west link road between the M181 / A1077(M) roundabout and Scotter Road to be delivered in its entirety as part of this application. The Link Road is identified as a key piece of infrastructure in the Lincolnshire Lakes Area Action Plan (AAP).

The provision of the full link road connecting would provide greater connectivity between the existing urban area to the east, the proposed development and the M181/A1077(M) for all residents and facilitate better public transport connections into the development site.

A sole point of vehicular access to the site from the M181/A1077(M) roundabout is a concern given the A1077(M) is still the responsibility of National Highways and designated as a motorway thereby restricting access to the site from certain modes of transport.

The timescales for de-trunking of the M181/A1077 (M) are currently unknown, although anticipated to be around 18 months. The A1077 (M) will also need to be de-classified to remove the motorway status as it will otherwise restrict who can access the development. The de-classification process will need to be supported by physical changes to the A1077 (M) between the northern roundabout and Frodingham Grange Roundabout, to allow for the safe movement of pedestrians and cyclists and reinforce the speed limits. This doesn't appear to be considered in the application. Further work is required to identify the necessary improvements. The developer would be expected to be contributing towards these, if not wholly funding them. This is particularly crucial if the full length of the east - west link road is not provided.

Given the size of the development, it is strongly recommended that the applicant has discussions with emergency services regarding whether a singular vehicular access to the site is suitable. The Council would not support an emergency vehicular access onto Brumby Common Lane due to width and condition of the road.

The width of the spine road is shown as 7.5m wide, which seems excessive and 6.75m would be more appropriate. The design and environment of the spine road will need to support a 30mph limit. Failure to do this at this stage is likely to result in issues relating to excessive vehicle speeds and would require NLC to retrofit traffic calming at our own cost.

Sustainable transport

It is noted that the proposals include the provision of a dedicated active travel route connecting the site to Scotter Road. Clarity over the phasing of the full delivery of this link in relation to the housing is required. Given the unknown timescales for the de-trunking and declassification of the A1077 (M), there is a risk that access to the site could be severely restricted for all modes other than private vehicles. Confirmation is also required as to whether this will be offered up to the Council for adoption.

Where the proposed active travel route crosses junctions on the link road, priority needs to be given to pedestrians and cyclists in accordance with LTN 1/20 and Active Travel England guidance. Cycle parking should be provided for each dwelling.

The proposals for segregation between the active travel route and Brumby Common Lane is not clear and needs to be clarified. There will also need to be segregation provided between the footway and cycle route along the proposed active travel corridor.

The provision of a controlled crossing on Scotter Road to link the sites active travel corridor with further NMU facilities along Scotter Road and West Common Lane is welcomed. However, it is not clear why a controlled crossing has been proposed on Bristol Road with nothing other than a widened central refuge proposed on West Common Lane. West Common Lane sees significantly higher traffic demand than Bristol Road and the Council would want to see a controlled crossing provided on West Common Lane.

What, if any measures are proposed to prevent pedestrians cutting across the cycle route between Scotter Road and Bristol Road. Pedestrians should have priority over cyclists on the verge between Scotter Road and Bristol Road.

A footway/cycleway will need to be provided to the proposed amenity area, although we wouldn't want either of these extended to the roundabout until the de-classification and supporting works have been completed, at which point they should be provided/funded by the developer.

Off-road pedestrian and cycle infrastructure will need to be provided on the north – south connection.

The provision of a controlled crossing on the link road within the site is required, to link the northern residential development to the proposed active travel route along Brumby Common Lane. A parallel crossing would be acceptable initially, although this would need upgrading to a signalised crossing once the link road connects through to Scotter Road.

The location of the bus stops on the link road are extremely close to the roundabout and should be moved further eastwards if possible. No bus stops are shown for Phase 2, NLC would recommend that some are provided. Whilst we understand why laybys have been provided, these are traditionally unpopular with bus operators in North Lincolnshire. We would recommend a discussion with NLC's Public Transport Team about the preferred style.

TRIP GENERATION

Trip rates utilised for residential and non-residential uses are acceptable. The non-primary trip assumptions / calculations appear reasonable.

It is noted that throughout the TA the maximum level of food retail is stated as 500m². However, Table 27 states up to 1,000m² of food retail is included in the trip generation. This needs to be confirmed.

Para 5.57 states that the development will target a 20% reduction in car driver trips. However, the TA further states a 14.3% reduction in car driver trips has been redistributed across other modes. Where is the additional 5.7% reduction coming from?

It is noted that the figures presented in Table 33 for car driver reflect a reduction of 20% and not the 14.3% stated in para 5.57. The AM, PM and Daily figures stated in Table 33 do not reflect the level of change stated in Table 32.

It is noted that these figures will be used to inform assessments in a TA Addendum but further details / information as to how they have been calculated will be required at that stage.

Similar clarity is required for the figures stated in para 5.61 and Tables 34 and 35. For instance the change in car driver figures from Table 31 to Table 35 reflect a decrease of 20%, as stated in para 5.61. However, the change in car passengers in the AM peak from 26 (Table 31) to 46 (Table 35) is a far greater than the +6% stated in Table 34.

Highway assessment parameters

The traffic growth factors obtained from TEMPRO are acceptable.

Highway impact assessment

The modelling of the junctions identified by the TA is considered appropriate. However, given that the TA only presents the results of the impact assessment and reserves any further proposals to mitigate against impacts for a TA Addendum there is nothing further to comment. Clarity is required as to when this will be provided as this is required to fully understand what mitigation measures may be required.

It is noted that the HGV% for some junction impact assessments is 0, whilst this does not impact on capacity results for a junction it assumes all vehicles are 5.75m long and can therefore lead to underreporting of queue lengths. Given that the models have been validated against queueing data this is not likely to pose an issue.

Travel plan

Whilst it is acknowledged that few services/amenities to the west of the site are identified in Figure 9, the walking and cycling catchments appear to rely on the use of Brumby Common Lane and other rural roads. Given the nature of Brumby Common Lane and the other surrounding roads it is not expected that this will be an attractive route for active travel and therefore could hinder any access to the west of the site.

We would query the feasibility of the modal split targets detailed in Section 6 and the TA. It is noted that a bus service will be provided through the development and the 35 service has been identified. However, this route only provides an hourly service. Whilst this has been discussed and agreed with the Council's public transport team, there is a risk that an hourly service won't be attractive enough to drive meaningful changes in travel patterns and behaviours for residents.

In addition to the above, given the active travel route and associated crossing facilities will not be provided until Phase 2 of the development, is it realistic to expect residents to alter travel patterns and behaviours once they have established the use of private vehicles.

This is particularly prevalent due to the connection with Scotter Road not being provided as part of the development and sole access being taken from the M181 / A1077(M) roundabout with timescales for the de-trunking and declassification of the A1077(M) being unknown.

The proposed modal split changes as part of the Vision and Validate method and how they were derived needs to be clarified.

There is a concern that the proposed development will be unsustainable in terms of transport, with private vehicles being the most practical and attractive option for many residents. A 20% reduction in car driver trips would appear ambitious given the identified constraints and it is unclear what mitigation measures would be put in place if this target isn't achieved.