

Development Management
Lincolnshire County Council
County Offices
Newland
Lincoln LN1 1YL
Tel: 01522 782070
developmentmanagement@lincolnshire.gov.uk

To: South Holland District Council

Application Ref: H16-0552-26

Proposal: **Erection of a 3-storey care home development with associated car parking, amenity space and ancillary structures**

Location: **Land off Shakespeare Way, Holland Park, Spalding**

With reference to the above application received 12 June 2026.

Notice is hereby given that Lincolnshire County Council's formal recommendation is as follows:

Deferral: LCC is not currently in a position to support the application and requests further assessment, supporting evidence, revisions and/or dialogue, as set out in the response.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED

Highways Comments

Based on the submitted details, it is acknowledged that the Transport Assessment concludes that the development is unlikely to result in a severe residual cumulative impact on the highway network. However, the assessment is primarily based on a traditional traffic impact methodology and does not reflect a vision-led approach to transport design as required by the NPPF. In particular, insufficient regard has been given to how the development should prioritise pedestrian movement and create a safe and legible environment, especially given the presence of vulnerable users associated with a care home use.

The proposed site access has been designed to accommodate large vehicles, with a 6.0m carriageway width and relatively generous corner radii. While this demonstrates technical compliance in terms of vehicle tracking, the geometry appears excessive in the context of the anticipated traffic levels and the nature of the development. This results in unnecessarily wide crossing distances and is likely to encourage higher vehicle speeds at the point of access, to the detriment of pedestrian safety.

There is a clear opportunity to refine the access design to better align with placemaking principles by reducing carriageway width and tightening kerb radii, thereby prioritising pedestrian movement and improving the overall quality of the frontage. The use of overrun

areas or reinforced margins (e.g. crossing pavers) could be considered to accommodate occasional larger vehicles without compromising the day-to-day function of the access, as well as block-paving across the access to highlight pedestrian priority when crossing. Please see the wider site where materials have been used to prioritise pedestrians.

Concerns are also raised in respect of the Travel Plan and supporting transport evidence. Whilst the Travel Plan includes conventional measures to encourage sustainable travel, it is closely aligned to the assumptions within the Transport Assessment and does not demonstrate a meaningful shift towards sustainable modes or a design-led approach to influencing travel behaviour. It is reactive rather than transformative and does not clearly integrate with the design of the site or address the needs of vulnerable users. **Please also refer to Travel Plan Officer comments appended to this response.**

Furthermore, the transport evidence does not provide sufficient clarity on staff numbers, shift patterns, or peak staffing levels. Given that staff movements are likely to form the primary component of daily trips, this represents a notable gap in the evidence base and limits the robustness of both the trip generation forecasts and the Travel Plan strategy.

Cycle parking provision is acceptable in terms of quantity; however, its proposed location appears poorly integrated within the site layout and does not reflect best practice guidance. It should be repositioned closer to the main entrance, where it benefits from natural surveillance, lighting, and a clear, direct route that avoids conflict with vehicular movements.

Drainage Comments

In respect of drainage, the submitted information correctly identifies that infiltration is not feasible due to very low permeability rates within the underlying soils and shallow groundwater levels. The strategy therefore relies on attenuation and discharge to the surface water sewer network, which is appropriate in principle given the site constraints. However, the current submission lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate compliance with national and local policy requirements. In particular:

- The proposed discharge rate of 2 l/s is not justified in relation to greenfield runoff rates (QBAR), and it is unclear whether this represents an appropriate restriction
- The reliance on a pumped drainage solution has not been justified, and it has not been demonstrated that a gravity outfall is unachievable
- There are inconsistencies in the reported groundwater levels between supporting documents
- Exceedance flow routes have not been identified, meaning it is unclear how the site would behave in events exceeding the design standard
- The proposed SuDS approach does not clearly demonstrate an appropriate treatment train or maximise the use of above-ground features
- Details of long-term management and maintenance arrangements are insufficient

The drainage strategy is not yet sufficiently developed to be secured purely by condition, and further information should be provided at this stage to confirm that an acceptable and policy-compliant solution can be delivered.

Summary of Required Amendments

Please provide further information in the following key areas:

- Review the proposed access geometry to reduce carriageway width and kerb radii to better prioritise pedestrian movement and minimise vehicle speeds, whilst still accommodating occasional service vehicles.
- Rework the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan to demonstrate a clear, designed strategy that prioritises walking, cycling, and accessibility for vulnerable users, rather than relying on existing travel patterns.
- Provide a detailed breakdown of staffing levels, shift patterns, and peak occupancy to ensure that trip generation and Travel Plan measures are robust and evidence-based.
- Relocate cycle parking to a more prominent, convenient and overlooked location close to the main entrance, ensuring safe and direct access without conflict with vehicles.
- Justify the proposed discharge rate in line with greenfield runoff rates (QBAR)
- Demonstrate that a gravity outfall is not feasible before relying on a pumped solution
- Resolve inconsistencies in groundwater data
- Provide exceedance flow routing plans
- Develop a clear SuDS treatment train, maximising above-ground features where possible

Case Officer:

Justine Robson

Date: 01 July 2026

This feedback has been produced by Lincolnshire County Council Sustainable Travel Officers with a view to address the walking, wheeling and, cycling aspects in response to **Holland Park Care Home on land off Shakespeare Way** submitted for comment.

Date: 23/06/26
Planning Application No: H16-0552-26

Summary

The Travel Plan provides a reasonable framework for promoting sustainable travel at the proposed Holland Park Care Home through the use of travel surveys, modal shift targets, staff engagement measures, and ongoing monitoring. The appointment of a Travel Plan Coordinator and commitment to annual review are positive aspects that support implementation. The plan relies heavily on promotional and behavioural measures, with limited detail on physical infrastructure improvements, funding commitments, and contingency actions should targets not be achieved. Furthermore, several targets are based on estimated rather than site-specific travel data, and further justification is required regarding cycle parking provision and the achievability of proposed modal shifts. Overall, the Travel Plan is considered acceptable in principle but would benefit from additional detail and stronger commitments to ensure it can effectively meet its objectives.

Please see comments below:

Ref	Travel Plan Reference	LCC Comment
	Cycling	Recommendation: Given the location and proximity within Spalding, more focus should be given to cycling opportunities, especially for employees.
1.5	Cycle Parking	The cycle provision appears low for a 75-bed care home considering the number of employees and visitors the site will attract. Recommendation: Consider a larger cycle storage unit to allow a suitable amount of cycle storage.
3.1 + 5.2	Travel Survey	The 2011 census data is now 15 years out of date, with more recent data being available. Recommendation: Use the 2021 census to based modal split and targets upon.
3.4	Travel Survey	Travel surveys being completed/collected between March and October is still a large period of time where different travel patterns may occur (for example with October being a darker, rainier month than June, travel patterns may vary). Recommendation: Keep survey period within a smaller time frame to ensure travel patterns do not shift because of the time of year (e.g. May to June).
5.0	Targets and Indicators	Modal shift targets are currently based on estimated data which may not be a true reflection of the site. Recommendation: Targets should be reviewed following baseline surveys.
Table 7.1	Measures	Travel packs being distributed within one week of employment being accepted is an excellent standard to adhere to.
7.4	Measures to Promote Cycling	Recommendation: Provide free or discounted cycle lighting sets (front/rear lights) specifically for shift workers as part of the Welcome Travel Pack. Ensure that cycle parking areas are sufficiently lit during all shift changeovers, especially for winter months Conduct a safety audit of local off-road cycle routes to check whether they remain safe/usable at night and signpost the safest lit routes.
9.4	Monitoring and Review	Recommendation: Within the monitoring report sent to the LCC each year, the TPC should include evidence of the initiatives put in place (e.g. the sustainable active gear, travel vouchers, travel pack).

	Budget	For the Travel Plan to be successful and for the TPC to effectively deliver on the aims, objectives and targets, a clear budget is required. Especially with schemes such as discounted tickets/vouchers to be implemented, sufficient budget is required. Recommendation: State in the travel plan that the TPC will have a budget at their disposal to ensure targets are met and make any adaptations to the travel plan as/when needed. Where possible, use the action plan/planned initiatives to base figures on. Ensure this is stated to be annually or for the entirety of the Travel Plan (5 years).
	Budget/obligations	The costs of carrying out the monitoring and review process are the responsibility of the developer. In order to successfully monitor a Travel Plan Highways Authority requires a monitoring fee (secured through a Section 106 agreement) to be paid by the developer/occupier to cover officer time and overheads required to coordinate and complete the monitoring process over the lifetime of the Travel Plan. The current charge is £1,000 per annum over 5 years.

Recommendation:

That the above comments are considered and a revised Travel Plan submitted for approval.

That S106 funding be requested to monitor and ensure that the Travel Plan is monitored by the developer.

Prepared By: Scott Broughton