

PEDALS - Spalding's Cycle Action Group

Chairman: David Jones, 19 Ladywood Rd, Spalding, PE11 2DA 01775 766145
davidjones2da@hotmail.com

Please reply to 18 Cley Hall Drive
SPALDING
PE11 2EB
dianaroger@hotmail.com

Objections to Application H16-0692-25, Proposed development south of Holbeach Road, Spalding

Objection 1

The proposed development fails to provide safe opportunities for cyclists and pedestrians to access the premises. It fails to comply with paragraph 4 of Policy 3 and paragraph 2(iv) of Policy 32 of the Local Plan. These policies support the environmental and health benefits of cycling, and the aim of offering people a choice of modes of transport.

Part 3.5 of the applicants' Transport Assessment identifies correctly that much of Spalding is within reasonable cycling distance of the site. However, the TA fails to acknowledge that the A16 is a significant barrier to convenient, safe cycling along the A151. Lincolnshire County Council has changed the McDonald's roundabout recently to reduce delays for traffic on the A16. The increased number of lanes entering and leaving the roundabout have made it more difficult for cyclists and pedestrians to cross the A16. Pedals continues to campaign for a bridge over the A16 for cyclists and pedestrians to cross safely.

Paragraph 115 (b) of the National Planning Policy Framework states "In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that: a) sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location; b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users".

Paragraph 3.5.2 of the TA refers to several settlements which are far from this site. This suggests that the author does not have sufficient knowledge of the local area and must cast doubts about the robustness of the TA. (There is a similar issue in paragraph 3.4.2 which refers to Epworth.)

Objection 2

The proposed development excludes facilities for cycle parking and storage. It therefore fails to comply with Local Plan Policy 36.

There are several indications in the application that this is a conscious omission from the proposal, and not merely an oversight. Part 4.4 of the Transport Assessment states the Local Plan's policies for parking (including cycle parking and storage) but only makes proposals for car parking. Paragraph 7.1.2 of the summary says that cycle parking will be provided. However, cycle parking for customers and cycle storage for staff are not shown on the submitted plans, and cycle parking is not indicated in the relevant part of the application form.

Conclusions

Objection 1 is fundamental to the proposal and should be a reason for refusing planning permission. The location fails to offer safe, convenient opportunities for active travel. There have been significant changes in circumstances since the Council granted planning permission previously for different plans: SHDC has adopted the current Local Plan, LCC has changed the McDonald's roundabout, and Governments have published policies for active travel.

Objection 2 could be overcome if the plans are changed to include acceptable cycle parking and storage in accordance with the Local Plan's policies.

*Roger Smith
On behalf of Pedals – Spalding's Cycle Action Group*

4th August 2025