

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
1	stat	stat	1. Objection in place until agreement is agreed where we agree to pay to divert or protect their electrical equipment.
2	stat	stat	1. Proposed land to be purchased through CPO is excessive and unnecessary. 2. Prejudicial to management and maintenance of cycle path. 3. Unclear on ownership after land acquired by CPO. 4. Needs explanation of how future continuity can be assured.
3		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns. 2. argument against costs of NMU 3. Increase in journey times 4. detriment to environment 5. housing growth not being considered 6. Personal inconvenience.
4		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns. 2. Questioning cost of each bridge option. 3. Traffic concerns. 4. Mobility concerns for persons with disabilities.
5		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. argument against costs of NM 3. Increase in journey times 4. detriment to environment 5. housing growth not being considered 6. Personal inconvenience.
6		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. New route is a personal inconvenience and should be reconsidered.
7		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increase in Journey times. 2. Congestion concerns.
8		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increase in journey times. 2. Add to outgoing costs.
9		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road, 1. Emergency services will take longer to get to residents. 2. Congestion concerns when new developments built
10		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. argument against costs of NMU 3. Increase in journey times 4. detriment to environment 5. housing growth not being considered 6. Personal inconvenience.
11		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increased journey times and financial costs.
12		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. personal inconvenience 3. extra time for emergency vehicles to respond 4. argument against costs of NMU 5. detriment to environment 6. housing growth not being considered
13		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety Concerns 2. Congestion Concerns.
14		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Would isolate Cherry Willingham 2. Increase in travel times 3. Negative impact on area 4. Increased personal costs due to travel.
15		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Would isolate Cherry Willingham. 2. Increase in travel times. 3. Negative impact on area. 4. Increased personal costs due to travel.
16		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increase in journey times and in personal cost. 2. ore hazardous route/safety concerns.
17		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. Road is used regularly for school runs 3. argument against costs of NMU
18		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increase in travel times and personal costs. 2. Kennel Lane is a dangerous road in winter.
19		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Proposed alternative routes are less safe and further to travel.
20		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. personal inconvenience 3. argument against costs of NMU 4. detriment to environment 5. housing growth not being considered
21		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. personal inconvenience 3. argument against costs of NMU 4. detriment to environment

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			5. housing growth not being considered
22		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. increase in journey times and vehicular movement leading to accidents 3. housing growth not being considered
23		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concern 2. increase of journey times 3. detrimental to environment 4. Argument against costs of NMU 5. Housing growth not being considered
24		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns at road junction 2. Argument against costs of NMU
25		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Extra travelling time. 2. Kennel Lane not safe as alternative route.
26		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. LILO junction not safe option. 2. Lack of visibility for other users. 3. Alternative routes are less safe. 4. Housing growth not considered. 5. Longer journey times.
27	stat	stat	1. Clarification over plots 2/10A and 2/10B. 2. Requiring an undertaking.
28		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. junction not suitable for amount of traffic 3. Alternative route is unworkable for amount of proposed traffic.
29		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes not safe 2. Increase volume of traffic on Alt route. 3. Housing developments not taking into account for extra traffic volume. 4. Argument against costs of NMU. 5. Environmental Impact 6. Personal inconvenience.
30		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Response times of emergency services will be longer to Hawthorn Road area.
31		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns for alternative routes. 2. Closure affects residents of the village and Carlton Estate residents. 3. Detrimental to Environment
32		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Community torn apart. 2. Reduction of road links to Lincoln from 3 to 2. 3. Longer journey times. 4. Emergency services response times compromised.
33		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Lose access route to Lincoln. 2. Alternative routes not as beneficial.
34		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns. Argument against cost of NMU. 2. Cost to environment.
35		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Congestion concerns. 2. Increase in journey times. 3. Safety of alternative routes. 4. Cuts off community.
36		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns of junction. 2. Argument against cost of NMU. 3. Environmental impact. 4. Personal inconvenience.
37		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns of junction. 2. Argument against cost of NMU. 3. Environmental impact. 4. Personal inconvenience.
38		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns of junction. 2. Argument against cost of NMU. 3. Environmental impact. 4. Personal inconvenience.
39		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Cut off Cherry Willingham. 2. Should be kept open.
40		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns. 2. Argument against cost of NMU. 3. Increase in journey times.
41		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increase journey times and personal costs. 2. Safety of alternative routes. 3. Increase in traffic.
42		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increase in journey times and distance.

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Would affect school numbers.</li> <li>3. Argument against cost of NMU.</li> </ol>
44		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>2. Concerns for safety of LILO junction.</li> <li>3. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>4. Argument against cost of NMU.</li> </ol>
45		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns</li> <li>2. Argument against cost of NMU.</li> <li>3. Increase in journey times</li> </ol>
46		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns</li> <li>2. Increased travel time and personal cost.</li> </ol>
47		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns of junction.</li> <li>2. Argument against cost of NMU.</li> <li>3. Environmental impact.</li> <li>4. Personal inconvenience.</li> </ol>
48		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>2. Increase volume of traffic on Alt route.</li> <li>3. Housing developments not taking into account for extra traffic volume.</li> <li>4. Argument against costs of NMU.</li> <li>5. Environmental Impact</li> <li>6. Personal inconvenience.</li> </ol>
49		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>2. Increase volume of traffic on Alt route.</li> <li>3. Housing developments not taken into account for extra traffic volume.</li> <li>4. Argument against costs of NMU.</li> <li>5. Environmental Impact</li> <li>6. Personal inconvenience.</li> </ol>
50		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lose access route to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not as beneficial.</li> </ol>
51		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lose access route to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not as beneficial.</li> </ol>
52		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in journey times and cost.</li> <li>2. Detrimental to the environment.</li> </ol>
53		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in journey times and costs.</li> <li>2. Arguments to wards cost of road bridge.</li> </ol>
54		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns.</li> <li>2. Arguments towards cost of NMU.</li> </ol>
55		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Housing developments not taken into account for extra traffic volume.</li> <li>2. Safety of alternative routes.</li> </ol>
56		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>2. Increase volume of traffic on Alt route.</li> <li>3. Housing developments not taken into account for extra traffic volume.</li> <li>4. Argument against costs of NMU.</li> <li>5. Environmental Impact</li> <li>6. Personal inconvenience.</li> </ol>
57		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased journey times.</li> <li>2. Detrimental to the environment.</li> <li>3. Alternative routes not safe or suitable for amount of traffic.</li> </ol>
58		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Avenue.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Route is essential for school, doctors and shops.</li> <li>2. Concern about emergency services response time.</li> <li>3. Cost of road bridge compared to pedestrian bridge.</li> </ol>
59		non	<p>Closure to Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not safe.</li> </ol>
60		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Route is essential for school, doctors and shops.</li> </ol>
61		non	<p>Closure to Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vital link between communities.</li> <li>2. No consideration of impact.</li> <li>3. Personal inconvenience.</li> </ol>
62		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>2. Increase volume of traffic on Alt route.</li> <li>3. Housing developments not taken into account for extra traffic volume.</li> <li>4. Argument against costs of NMU.</li> <li>5. Environmental Impact</li> <li>6. Personal inconvenience.</li> </ol>
63		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns</li> <li>2. Personal inconvenience.</li> </ol>
64		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road.

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			1. Safety and Traffic Concerns
65		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Without it we would be cut off. 2. Alternative routes not safe.
66		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Main road used between Cherry Willingham and Reepham. 2. Alternative routes will be made busier.
67		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increase in Traffic. 2. Alternative routes not safe especially during winter.
68		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Hawthorn Road is safest route out of village.
69		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Traffic concerns. 2. Danger to cyclists on alternative routes.
70		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Alternative routes not safe. 2. Increase volume of traffic on Alt route. 3. Housing developments not taken into account for extra traffic volume. 4. Argument against costs of NMU. 5. Environmental Impact 6. Personal inconvenience. 7. Extra costs of travel and child minder due to travel times.
71		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Detriment to sale of house. 2. Safety of Alternative routes.
72		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Alternative routes not safe. 2. Increase volume of traffic on Alt route. 3. Housing developments not taken into account for extra traffic volume. 4. Argument against costs of NMU. 5. Environmental Impact
73		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increase in journey times.
74		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increase in journey times.
75		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Traffic concerns at high volume times. 2. Increased journey times. 3. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge. 4. Personal inconvenience
76		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Traffic concerns at high volume times. 2. Increased journey times. 3. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge. 4. Personal inconvenience
77		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge. 2. Safety concerns. 3. Housing growth not taken into consideration. 4. Detrimental to environment. 5. Alternative roads not safe.
78		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. NMU does not meet requirements of local villages. 2. Safety concerns. 3. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge.
79		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Cut the area off from amenities. 2. Longer journey times. 3. Will increase congestion along Kennel Lane. 4. Question over costs. 5. Should be a road bridge.
80		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes e.g. Kennel Road not suitable.
81		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. Argument against costs of NMU 3. Increase in journey times 4. Detriment to environment 5. Housing growth not being considered 6. Personal inconvenience.
82		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increase in traffic. 2. Roundabout would be better option. 3. Revised footbridge costs more than original plan.
83		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Personal inconvenience. 2. Other routes will become more congested and become a rat run. 3. Increase in travel times. 4. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge. 5. Should be dual carriageway.
84		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes not viable.
85		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. Argument against costs of NMU 3. Increase in journey times

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Detriment to environment</li> <li>5. Housing growth not being considered</li> <li>6. Personal inconvenience</li> </ul>
86		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in travel times and costs.</li> <li>2. Hawthorn is the safest route.</li> </ul>
87		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hawthorn is the safest and most direct route.</li> <li>2. Closure will cause more traffic to use other areas.</li> </ul>
88		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in travel times.</li> </ul>
89		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not viable.</li> <li>2. Increase in travel times.</li> </ul>
90		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not viable for heavy traffic.</li> </ul>
91		non	Closure of Hawthorn road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe for users (e.g. Kennel Lane)</li> </ul>
92		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe for users (e.g. Kennel Lane)</li> <li>2. Personal inconvenience.</li> <li>3. Hawthorn Road more beneficial to local community.</li> </ul>
93		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in journey times and costs.</li> <li>2. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>3. Should be dual carriageway..</li> </ul>
94		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Longer journey times.</li> <li>2. Effect on the environment split local community.</li> <li>3. Alternative routes not safe.</li> </ul>
95		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road.
96		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns. .</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not safe for users (e.g. Kennel Lane)</li> <li>3. Congestion concerns in villages.</li> <li>4. Impact on local economy.</li> <li>5. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>6. Housing Growth not been considered.</li> <li>7. Concern for access of Emergency Vehicles.</li> </ul>
97		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Consideration for local people.</li> <li>2. Housing Growth not been considered.</li> <li>3. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge</li> <li>4. Most traffic will have to use Kennel Lane.</li> </ul>
98		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Congestion concerns.</li> <li>2. Safety concerns.</li> <li>3. Alternative routes not safe for users (e.g. Kennel Lane).</li> <li>4. The LILLO will become dangerous to use.</li> <li>5. Extra traffic will be encouraged to use village as rat run.</li> <li>6. Housing Growth not been considered.</li> <li>7. Increased journey times.</li> </ul>
99		non	Closure of Hawthorn road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge Cost could be recouped by not having a LILLO.</li> <li>2. New developments not been taken into account.</li> <li>3. Increased journey times and cost.</li> </ul>
100		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are not safe.</li> <li>2. Safety concerns.</li> <li>3. Personal Inconvenience.</li> </ul>
101		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased journey times.</li> <li>2. Concern about emergency services response times.</li> </ul>
102		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerns of extra traffic in Fiskerton.</li> </ul>
103		NOT USED	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic concerns.</li> <li>2. No consideration for local people.</li> <li>3. Argument against cost of NMU</li> </ul>
104		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns</li> <li>2. Argument against costs of NMU</li> <li>3. Increase in journey times</li> <li>4. Detriment to environment</li> <li>5. Housing growth not being considered</li> <li>6. Personal inconvenience</li> </ul>
105		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Longer journey times.</li> <li>2. Traffic concerns.</li> <li>3. Alternative routes are not safe.</li> <li>4. New developments not been taken into account.</li> <li>5. Outer Circle/Wragby Road is a hotspot yet more traffic will be forced this way.</li> </ul>
106		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Longer journey times.</li> <li>2. Traffic concerns.</li> <li>3. Alternative routes are not safe.</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			4. New developments not been taken into account. Outer Circle/Wragby Road is a hotspot yet more traffic will be forced this way.
107		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Stop access to St Barnabas Hospice Day Centre. 2. Only access to Carlton Shopping Centre. 3. Longer journey times. 4. Increase in volume of traffic.
108		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. Argument against costs of NMU 3. Increase in journey times 4. Detriment to environment 5. Housing growth not being considered 6. Personal inconvenience
109		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Longer journey times. 2. Tennis Club and membership will be cut off due to no road link. 3. Alternative routes not safe.
110		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Detrimental to survival of Cherry Willingham. 2. NMU insufficient to meet the needs of local communities. 3. NMU and LILO plans do not consider safety of users where the NMU meets the LILO junction. 4. Argument against costs of NMU. 5. Increase in journey times. 6. Housing growth not being 7. Detrimental to the environment.
111		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Pedestrian safety especially school children at foot bridge area. 2. Unsafe access via Kennel Lane. 3. Does not take in effect of road closures due to accidents or maintenance. 4. More traffic deciding to use Cherry Willingham. 5. Better to wait for funds to be available to build better solution.
112		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. Argument against costs of NMU 3. Increase in journey times 4. Detriment to environment 5. Housing growth not being considered 6. Personal inconvenience
113		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Hamper access to schools 2. Delay emergency services.
114		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. Argument against costs of NMU 3. Increase in journey times 4. Detriment to environment 5. Housing growth not being considered 6. Personal inconvenience
115		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increase in journey times and costs. 2. Closure detrimental to villages. 3. Emergency vehicles will be delayed. 4. Kennel Lane will need to be upgraded to handle increase in traffic. 5. View of residents not been taken into account. 6. Argument against costs of NMU,
116		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Extra traffic in the villages will make it more hazardous. 2. Alternative routes not safe. 3. Increased journey times and costs.. 4. Concern over emergency vehicle response times
117		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes not safe 2. Safety concerns 3. Argument against costs of NMU 4. Increase in journey times 5. Detriment to environment 6. Housing growth not being considered
118		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. Argument against costs of NMU 3. Increase in journey times 4. Detriment to environment 5. Housing growth not being considered 6. Personal inconvenience
119		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety of the NMU users needs clarification. 2. Single one-way road bridge has not been considered. 3. Other routes not safe to use. 4. Argument against cost of NMU. 5. Housing growth not considered. 6. Increased journey times. 7. Why not dual carriageway.
120		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Would deny direct access in both directions. 2. Traffic flow will increase through Reepham.

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
121		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. Argument against costs of NMU 3. Housing growth not being considered 4. Personal inconvenience
122		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increased journey times. 2. Housing growth not considered. 3. Alternative routes not safe. 4. Cuts off direct access.
123		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Detrimental to villages. 2. Increased journey times and costs. 3. Concerns over emergency services response times to area.
124		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increased journey times and traffic in villages. 2. Argument against cost of NMU
125		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increase journey times and traffic in villages. 2. Argument against cost of NMU
126		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes not safe. 2. Longer journey times and extra costs. 3. Increase traffic through village.
127		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increased journey times and costs. 2. Alternative routes not viable or safe.
128		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Cut off the community to amenities. 2. Housing growth not considered. 3. Concern over emergency response times.
129		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety Concerns. 2. Will increase traffic through villages.
130		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes not viable or safe. 2. Argument against cost of NMU. 3. Increased journey times and costs.
131		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increased journey times and costs. 2. Taxi customers will incur more costs. 3. Concern over emergency response times. 4. Argument against cost of NMU. 5. Congestion fears through villages.
132		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. No direct access to amenities. 2. Alternative routes not safe or viable. 3. Increased journey times and costs. 4. Concerns over emergency response times.
133		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increased journey times and costs. 2. Alternative routes are not safe.
134		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes not safe. 2. Increase in journey times. 3. Housing growth not considered. 4. Safety concerns for pedestrians along village road due to increase in traffic. 5. Argument against cost of NMU.
135		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes are not a safe option.
136		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Cut off direct route to north side of Lincoln. 2. Extra traffic will pass through villages. 3. Alternative routes not safe. 4. Increased journey times and costs. 5. Housing growth not considered.
137		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes not viable. 2. Increased journey times and costs.
138		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes not safe. 2. Housing growth not considered. 3. Increase of traffic through villages. 4. Increased journey times and costs.
139		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increased journey times and costs. 2. Alternative routes are not safe.
140		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes not viable. 2. Village will become a rat run for traffic.
141		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Be cut off from amenities. 2. Lack of suitable alternative routes. 3. Will not help falling numbers at schools. 4. Personal inconvenience.
142		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns of alternative routes.

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>3. Argument against costs of NMU.</li> <li>4. Concern over emergency services response times.</li> </ul>
143		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cherry Willingham the only ones not to benefit from bypass.</li> <li>2. Limited access to local facilities.</li> <li>3. Increased journey times.</li> <li>4. Alternative routes are dangerous</li> </ul>
144		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access stopped by scheme.</li> <li>2. Object to the fact that a few horse riders have taken priority over hundreds of other road user.</li> </ul>
145		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns</li> <li>2. Argument against costs of NMU</li> <li>3. Increase in journey times</li> <li>4. Detriment to environment</li> <li>5. Housing growth not being considered</li> <li>6. Personal inconvenience.</li> <li>7. Danger to pedestrians if horse becomes spooked on NMU.</li> </ul>
146		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Congestion concerns within villages.</li> <li>2. The roads are unsuitable for increased traffic.</li> </ul>
147		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of traditional access to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Will increase traffic along other routes.</li> <li>3. Motorists in greater danger trying to join single carriageway bypass.</li> <li>4. Increased journey times and costs.</li> </ul>
148		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158)</li> <li>2. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>3. Will increase traffic within the villages.</li> </ul>
149		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of traditional access to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not viable or safe.</li> <li>3. Safety concerns</li> <li>4. Argument against costs of NMU</li> <li>5. Increase in journey times</li> <li>6. Detriment to environment</li> <li>7. Housing growth not being considered</li> </ul>
150		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe or viable.</li> <li>2. Increase of traffic through Cherry Willingham.</li> <li>3. Argument against costs of NMU</li> <li>4. Increase in journey times</li> <li>5. Detriment to environment</li> <li>6. Housing growth not being considered</li> </ul>
151		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158).</li> <li>2. Argument against costs of NMU.</li> <li>3. Detriment to environment</li> <li>4. Housing growth not being considered.</li> <li>5. Increased journey times and costs.</li> </ul>
152		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158).</li> <li>2. Argument against costs of NMU</li> <li>3. Detriment to environment</li> <li>4. Housing growth not being considered.</li> <li>5. Increased journey times and costs</li> </ul>
153		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158).</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>3. Housing growth not being considered.</li> <li>4. Argument against costs of NMU.</li> </ul>
154		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158).</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not safe</li> <li>3. Housing growth not being considered.</li> <li>4. Argument against costs of NMU</li> </ul>
155		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Congestion fears at Kennel Lane junction.</li> <li>2. Lose access to amenities.</li> <li>3. Rather keep road than bridge.</li> </ul>
156		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No alternative to the direct access it provides.</li> <li>2. Argument against costs of NMU.</li> <li>3. Increased journey time and costs</li> </ul>
157		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns.</li> <li>2. LILLO is extremely dangerous.</li> <li>3. Argument against cost of NMU.</li> <li>4. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>5. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>6. Detrimental to environment.</li> <li>7. Needs to be dual carriageway</li> </ul>
158		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns</li> <li>2. Argument against costs of NMU</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Increase in journey times</li> <li>4. Detriment to environment</li> <li>5. Housing growth not being considered</li> <li>6. Personal inconvenience.</li> <li>7. Increased journey times and cost.</li> <li>8. No reasonable alternative to direct access route.</li> </ul>
159		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>2. Increased pollution.</li> <li>3. Argument against cost of either options.</li> <li>4. Increase in travel times.</li> <li>5. Increase of traffic volumes due to development in area.</li> </ul>
160		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in travel times and costs.</li> <li>2. Impede response times for her veterinary business.</li> </ul>
161		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Housing growth not being considered.</li> <li>2. Safety concerns of alternative routes.</li> <li>3. If a route is closed for any reason this will push extra traffic onto unsuitable alternatives.</li> </ul>
162		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not viable.</li> <li>2. Extra journey times.</li> <li>3. Argument against cost of MNU.</li> </ul>
163		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not viable or safe.</li> <li>2. Will cut off community/schools.</li> <li>3. Increase in journey times and cost.</li> <li>4. Housing growth not being considered.</li> </ul>
164		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Closure will overload other routes.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>3. Will break link to amenities.</li> <li>4. Argument against cost of NMU.</li> <li>5. Increase in journey times.</li> </ul>
165		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Longer journey times.</li> <li>2. Congestion fears.</li> <li>3. Argument against cost of NMU.</li> </ul>
166		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased mileage and cost.</li> <li>2. Poor public transport network so need road to access amenities directly.</li> <li>3. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>4. Argument against cost of NMU.</li> <li>5. Concern it will affect emergency services response times.</li> <li>6. Housing growth not being considered.</li> </ul>
167		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lose traditional access to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Safety concerns at NMU and LILO junction.</li> <li>3. Increased journey times.</li> <li>4. Alternative routes not safe.</li> </ul>
168		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns</li> <li>2. Argument against costs of NMU</li> <li>3. Increase in journey times</li> <li>4. Detriment to environment</li> <li>5. Housing growth not being considered</li> <li>6. Personal inconvenience</li> </ul>
169		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety of NMU Bridge.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not safe or viable.</li> <li>3. Argument against costs of NMU.</li> <li>4. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>5. Housing growth not considered.</li> <li>6. Detrimental to environment.</li> <li>7. Won't be enough users of NMU to warrant it.</li> </ul>
170		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of suitable alternative routes.</li> <li>2. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>3. Congestion fears at proposed LILO.</li> <li>4. Argument against costs of NMU.</li> </ul>
171		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extra travel time and costs.</li> <li>2. Safety of other routes due to more traffic.</li> </ul>
172		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>3. Concern it will affect emergency services response times.</li> <li>4. A158 is always congested.</li> </ul>
173		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safest and most direct route to access Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes are not safe.</li> <li>3. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>4. Detrimental to environment.</li> <li>5. Housing growth not considered.</li> <li>6. Argument against cost of NMU.</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			7. Concern it will affect emergency services response times.
174		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Concern it will affect emergency services response times. 2. Extra cost in travel. 3. Alternative routes not safe.
175		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Restrict options of getting to Lincoln. 2. Hawthorn Road is safest route. 3. Concern it will affect emergency services response times. 4. Increase of traffic through villages.
176		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safest of all roads leading to villages. 2. Road bridge only answer due to usage by residents. 3. Increased travel times and costs.
177		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Lose traditional access to Lincoln. 2. Alternative routes don't have same benefits. 3. Increased journey times.
178		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. Argument against costs of NMU 3. Increase in journey times 4. Detriment to environment 5. Housing growth not being considered 6. Personal inconvenience
179		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. Argument against costs of NMU 3. Increase in journey times 4. Detriment to environment 5. Housing growth not being considered 6. Personal inconvenience
180		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns of alternative routes 2. Argument against costs of NMU 3. Increase in journey times 4. Personal inconvenience
181		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes are not suitable. 2. Increased journey times.
182		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Most direct route to Lincoln. 2. NMU plans not adequate for villages. 3. Proposed LILLO is extremely dangerous. 4. Argument against cost of NMU. 5. Increased fuel bills. 6. Alternative routes not safe. 7. Detrimental to the environment. 8. Bypass needs to be dual carriageway.
183		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increase of traffic on remaining alternatives. 2. Increase journey times and costs. 3. Closure will make it difficult to access 4. Carlton Centre. 5. Alternative routes not safe for users. 6. Impact on the environment.
184		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Congestion concerns. 2. Concerned with safety of alternative routes. 3. Increase journey times and costs. 4. NMU would be no benefit to most of the residents. 5. Costs for road bridge and minimal increase.
185		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Impact on journey times. 2. Increase child care costs due to late fees or added time to allow for journey into and out of Lincoln.
186		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Will lose direct access to Lincoln. 2. Increased journey times and costs. 3. Alternative routes not viable or safe. 4. New development not being considered. 5. Concern over response times of emergency services. 6. Request a road bridge is incorporated instead of NMU.
187		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158). 2. Increase journey times. 3. Difficult to access local amenities. 4. Alternative routes not safe. 5. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road bridge. 6. New development not being considered. 7. Original Road bridge is the most practical solution.
188		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes not safe.
189		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. No longer be able to access Bunkers Hill for school bus. 2. Increased journey times and costs. 3. Alternative routes not safe.

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
190		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increased journey times and costs. 2. Alternative routes not safe.
191		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Will lose traditional access to Lincoln. 2. Safety concerns of alternative routes, 3. Increase in journey times 4. Personal inconvenience
192		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns of alternative routes 2. Argument against costs of NMU, 3. Increase in journey times 4. Personal inconvenience
193		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Cut off villagers and pupils to local schools. 2. Kennel Road alternative not suitable.
194		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Normal journey route blocked by closure. 2. Increased journey times. 3. Alternative routes not safe.
195		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Kennel Lane not viable alternative route in current form.
196		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU Bridge and A158). 2. Argument against costs of NMU versus Road Bridge. 3. Increased journey times and costs. 4. Alternative routes not safe. 5. Sever link in the community.
197		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Kennel Lane alternative not safe.
198		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Closure will force traffic onto alternative routes, these are already used heavily. 2. Concern of emergency services response times to area. 3. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158). 4. Extra traffic on A158 will encourage drivers to use village roads. 5. Will affect schools in the area. 6. Increased journey times and costs.
199		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes not safe to use and not suitable for increased volumes of traffic.
200		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increased journey times and costs. 2. Alternative roads are not safe. 3. Argument against NMU versus Road bridge.
201		non	Stopping up of Hawthorn Road. 1. No reasonable alternative. 2. Danger to pedestrians and car users.
202		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Historical arterial road to villages of Cherry Willingham, Fiskerton and Reepham. 2. Road Bridge required.
203		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road
204		non	Stopping up of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety of users where NMU meets LILO junction. 2. Cost of road bridge. 3. Increased pollution with increased journey. 4. Not clear what consideration has been given to housing growth in eastern Lincoln quadrant.
205			
206		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative route not viable. 2. Increase petrol consumption and expense. 3. Personal inconvenience.
207		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Hawthorn road safest and most economical route. 2. Cherry Willingham increase in traffic due to people using Fiskerton Road to access Lincoln
208		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. No reasonable alternative. 2. Increased risk of accidents by using Kennel Lane or Fiskerton Road. 3. Increased fuel cost, increased pollution. 4. No reliability of journey times
209		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. No proposed alternative can match the road with the benefits that it offers. . 2. Safety of users where NMU meets the LILO junction. 3. Cost of Road Bridge negligible in scheme. 4. Concerns about LEB in the immediate future due to development. 5. Road Bridge could be part of development plans.
210		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. No reasonable alternative. 2. Increased risk of accidents by using Kennel Lane or Fiskerton Road. 3. Increased fuel cost, increased pollution. 4. No Reliability of journey times.
211		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. No reasonable alternative 2. Fiskerton Road - increased traffic passing through Cherry Willingham 3. Less safe for pedestrians and cars. 4. Increased journey times and costs. 5. LILO increases number of junctions on bypass reducing safety due to incoming/outgoing traffic. 6. Economic benefits of NMU are negligible compared to Road Bridge.

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
212		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes less safe.</li> <li>2. Existing school of Carlton Estate only has an intake into reception.</li> <li>3. More vehicles with proposed development. .</li> <li>4. Road bridge better long term solution.</li> </ol>
213		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are not the safest.</li> <li>2. Only way out of the village is Kennel Lane. Exiting onto A158.</li> <li>3. Extra miles and extra fuel costs.</li> </ol>
214		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Travel times will double and cost of fuel will increase. .</li> <li>2. Safety of crossing</li> </ol>
215		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased cost of extra travel and extra time.</li> <li>2. Emergency services will be delayed and lives endangered.</li> </ol>
216		non	Closure of Hawthorn. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety costs and inconvenience.</li> <li>2. Kennel lane unsafe.</li> <li>3. Access to A158 bad enough already.</li> <li>4. Increased mileage and costs, longer travelling times.</li> <li>5. Delays to emergency responders. Road Bridge required.</li> </ol>
217		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Junction which was deemed unsafe previously.</li> <li>2. Hawthorn Road only route into eastern Lincoln which does not require negotiating bypass traffic.</li> <li>3. Position of park and ride outlined in recent local plan will attract large numbers of additional vehicles.</li> <li>4. Development outlined in local plan will mean increase in vehicle movements.</li> <li>5. Alternatives are unsuitable</li> </ol>
218		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reasonable alternative</li> <li>2. Footbridge is not acceptable.</li> <li>3. Road bridge should be built.</li> </ol>
219		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reasonably convenient alternative.</li> </ol>
220		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reasonable alternative.</li> <li>2. Safety of users where NMU meets LILO</li> <li>3. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible compared to cost of NMU and scheme.</li> <li>4. Potential for development in eastern Lincoln raises concerns about LEB in the future.</li> <li>5. Increased travel times and journey cost.</li> </ol>
221		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Only road that is safe in the winter.</li> <li>2. Alternative of Fiskerton road is not safe.</li> </ol>
222		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are less safe, longer and give additional costs.</li> <li>2. Added pressure on junctions.</li> <li>3. Too many roundabouts on bypass.</li> <li>4. Road bridge will ease some congestion</li> <li>5. Cost for Road Bridge against NMU doesn't 'add up'.</li> <li>6. LILO not safe for bridge users.</li> </ol>
223		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road traffic would increase.</li> <li>2. Roads will be used as 'rat runs'.</li> <li>3. Emergency services will be delayed.</li> </ol>
224		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No alternative route.</li> <li>2. Difference in cost for road bridge is negligible.</li> <li>3. Current NMU plans do not consider safety of road users where NMU meets LILO junction of LEB and Hawthorn Road.</li> </ol>
225		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Narrow roads will not cope with increased traffic.</li> <li>2. Safety risks and the day to day running of peoples lives.</li> <li>3. Increased response time for emergency services.</li> </ol>
226		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction will close off 2 routes into Lincoln.</li> </ol>
227		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety of users where the NMU meets LILO junction.</li> <li>2. Public right of way between the A158 and Hawthorn Road/NMU does not have a crossing point extended to the far east to access the NMU – unsafe.</li> <li>3. Cost of road bridge could be mitigated against removing the LILO junction .</li> <li>4. Increase in fuel costs – in distance and time taken. Reliability of journey times will be lost./</li> <li>5. Increased pollution.</li> <li>6. Housing developments impact on capacity of LEB</li> </ol>
228		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reasonable alternative.</li> <li>2. Increase in fuel costs.</li> <li>3. Longer journeys in distance and time taken.</li> <li>4. Road closure will cut business in half.</li> <li>5. Cost of NMU has increased – difference for Road Bridge is negligible.</li> <li>6. Safety for road users where NMU meets LILO junction.</li> <li>7. Increase in housing development being planned which will put a huge pressure</li> </ol>
229		non	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Object to the closure of through traffic to Lincoln from Cherry Willingham.</li> <li>2. Object to using kennel lane as an alternative. Junction with A158 is dangerous.</li> <li>3. Object to making Fiskerton to Lincoln the main thoroughfare</li> <li>4. Longer travelling times for emergency vehicles.</li> </ol>
230		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More dangerous using Kennel lane and travelling towards Skegness. Kennel lane not a safe option</li> <li>2. Speeding will be exasperated.</li> </ol>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Cars parked on the road near junction causing delays.</li> <li>4. Inconveniencing tax payer</li> <li>5. Cost of Road Bridge negligible and could be mitigated by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>6. Increase in cost and time.</li> </ul>
231		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reasonable alternative</li> <li>2. Safety of users where NMU meets LILO.</li> <li>3. Public right of way between A158 and NMU does not have a crossing point extended to east to access NMU.</li> <li>4. Additional cost of Road Bridge cancelled out by removing LILO.</li> <li>5. Increased traffic.</li> <li>6. Increased environmental impact.</li> <li>7. Growth in housing volume not considered for impact on LEB.</li> <li>8. Increased cost</li> <li>9. Increased journey times and increased risk of having an accident.</li> </ul>
232		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased traffic Cherry Willingham.</li> <li>2. Alternatives not safe</li> <li>3. Access by emergency services.</li> <li>4. Longer journey to school for children.</li> <li>5. Increased mileage and volume of traffic.</li> <li>6. Increased risk of traffic accidents</li> </ul>
233		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cost of Road Bridge will be minimal.</li> </ul>
234		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased traffic through Cherry Willingham.</li> <li>2. Waterford Lane not included in the traffic flow diagram.</li> <li>3. Traffic using Greetwell lane will double increasing risk of further accidents and potential fatalities.</li> <li>4. Proposed roundabout will make queues worse</li> <li>5. Alternative routes not suitable.</li> <li>6. Collision analysis did not include this junction.</li> <li>7. Concerns over response times of emergency services.</li> <li>8. Cost of road bridge small when taking into account serious conditions and risks if road closed.</li> <li>9. Areas of key congestion of the north-west section of the A46 between A57 Saxilby Road and A15 (transport assessment) won't be alleviated.</li> <li>10. Increase traffic on northern area of A46 and A158.</li> <li>11. Inconvenience to people in housing in Hawthorn Road area.</li> </ul>
235		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cuts us off from family at the other side of Hawthorn Road.</li> <li>2. Increased traffic in Cherry Willingham and more traffic onto Fiskerton Road.</li> </ul>
236		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safest in bad weather and more straightforward.</li> <li>2. Traffic would increase.</li> <li>3. Effect on enrolment numbers at school.</li> <li>4. Traffic through Cherry Willingham will increase especially with the build programme.</li> <li>5. Increase traffic on outer circle road.</li> <li>6. Impossible for emergency services to keep up times.</li> </ul>
237		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. School traffic will go through Cherry Willingham; Fiskerton Road is not a good road.</li> <li>2. Meeting up with roundabout bringing in traffic from 4 roads.</li> <li>3. Long queues in all directions. .</li> <li>4. More houses to be built.</li> </ul>
238		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More dangerous and hazardous to get onto Fiskerton Road.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes are not good with more hazards.</li> <li>3. Walking dogs along Fiskerton Road will be spoilt because of noise and fumes.</li> </ul>
239		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NMU does not meet requirements of local villages.</li> <li>2. No direct access to local hospice, schools and (in inclement weather) hospital, GPS fire service and ambulance services.</li> <li>3. Fiskerton road and Greetwell road are impassable with slight snow fall.</li> <li>4. A158 impossible to access from Kennel lane.</li> </ul>
240		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Current NMU does not consider safety where meets LILO.</li> <li>2. PROW does not have crossing point extended to far east to access NMU.</li> <li>3. Cost of Road Bridge negligible and mitigated by removing LILO.</li> <li>4. No reliability for journey times.</li> <li>5. Increased pollution from extra mileage.</li> <li>6. Housing growth will impact on LEB.</li> <li>7. Increased mileage fuels bills. Shop locally and this will be affected.</li> <li>8. Fiskerton Road is poor and not built for volume of traffic.</li> </ul>
241		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NMU plans don't consider safety.</li> <li>2. Visibility problems where vehicles leave LEB and join Hawthorn Road.</li> <li>3. Cost of bridge negligible, mitigated by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>4. Increase in CO2.</li> <li>5. Housing growth mean more traffic through Cherry Willingham.</li> <li>6. Increase in journey times.</li> </ul>
242		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lose quiet village and lose main route into Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Village will become a 'rat run' from A158.</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane, croft lane and Waterford lane not adequate roads for major traffic.</li> </ul>
243		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lose quiet village and lose main route into Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Village will become a 'rat run' from A158.</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane, croft lane and Waterford lane not adequate roads for major traffic.</li> </ul>
244		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additional travel costs and inconvenience</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn unsafe</li> <li>3. Should be dual c\way</li> <li>4. Additional housing development will exacerbate issues</li> <li>5. Single c\way does not have sufficient capacity at present or in future</li> <li>6. Single c\way not as safe as dual</li> <li>7. SCI states not consultation on single c\way option – why? Time constraints?</li> <li>8. No O&amp;D survey for A15\Hawthorn Rd jctn</li> <li>9. Level of traffic flows not suitable for single c\way – 13000 AADT is trigger</li> <li>10. Lack of appropriate consultation</li> </ol>
245		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives mean increased mileage and in bad weather are not suitable to amount of traffic.</li> </ol>
246		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reasonable alternative.</li> <li>2. Difference in cost of road bridge negligible. Closure will effect value of house.</li> <li>3. Increased journey length and time.</li> <li>4. Extra miles detrimental effect on environment.</li> <li>5. Safety of LILO. .</li> <li>6. Traffic data include traffic during summer months.</li> <li>7. Traffic light controlled single file bridge (and weight restriction) resolves this problem.</li> </ol>
247		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traditional access route to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Access to Wragby Road in morning/evening will be extremely difficult.</li> <li>3. Emergency traffic times will be increased. Increased cost.</li> <li>4. Use of Kennel Lane</li> </ol>
248		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lose of the traditional access route into Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Increased journey cost and time.</li> <li>3. Roads not safe.</li> <li>4. Extra mileage has a detrimental effect on environment.</li> <li>5. Access to Carlton Boulevard.</li> </ol>
249		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road safety – of Kennel Lane.</li> <li>2. Junction with Kennel lane A158 needs improving.</li> <li>3. Increase journey time, mileage and fuel consumption.</li> </ol>
250		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety of current NMU where meet LILO.</li> <li>2. PROW between A158 and HR NMU bridge does not have a crossing point extended to the far east to access NMU – unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians.</li> <li>3. Visibility sight lines from joining LEB to HR.</li> <li>4. Cost of road bridge negligible and mitigated by removing LILO.</li> <li>5. Increased fuel bills and journey times.</li> <li>6. Reliability will be lost.</li> <li>7. Increased CO2 from extra miles.</li> <li>8. Housing growth- concerns about capacity of LEB already even before consideration if given to new housing development.</li> <li>9. Increased mileage and journey times.</li> <li>10. Access to Carlton centre.</li> </ol>
251		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative route to Fiskerton not safe during winter months.</li> <li>2. NMU unsafe crossing.</li> <li>3. Fire and ambulance services deem this an 'accident waiting to happen'.</li> <li>4. Safety – extra mileage, congestion and build up of extra traffic on Fiskerton Road and Kennel Lane</li> </ol>
252		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are dangerous – Kennel lane and Greetwell lane in winter months are renowned for accidents.</li> <li>2. Railway Bridge impassable.</li> <li>3. Kennel lane leads to A158- in summer lots of traffic on this road.</li> <li>4. Access to Carlton Estate.</li> <li>5. Increase in housing and residents put pressure on Kennel lane.</li> </ol>
253		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Important link to Bunkers Hill and Carlton Centre.</li> <li>2. Forced to use Kennel lane and A158. Road is busy now and could not cope with increased traffic.</li> <li>3. Schools in Cherry Willingham and Reepham less accessible for people on Carlton Estate.</li> <li>4. Already used as a rat run – worse with increased traffic flow.</li> <li>5. Increase in commuting time and distance – longer to get to children in school</li> <li>6. Increased fuel costs and extra wear on vehicle.</li> <li>7. Cost of Road Bridge not insurmountable.</li> </ol>
254		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lose of direct safe route into Lincoln. Decision made without consulting villagers of Cherry Willingham and surrounding villages.</li> <li>2. Housing developments will increase the amount of traffic using this safe direct route.</li> </ol>
255		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create increased traffic through already busy village centre.</li> <li>2. Increase fuel bills, increase pollution and increase journey times.</li> <li>3. Response times for emergency vehicles increase.</li> <li>4. Impact on Carlton Centre.</li> </ol>
256		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased journey times, fuel consumption and increased pollution.</li> <li>2. Safety – emergency services need swift access to district.</li> <li>3. Kennel lane junction with Wragby road more dangerous with traffic flowing at full speed.</li> <li>4. Kennel lane not fit for purpose as a substitute.</li> </ol>
257		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road. .</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Closure will double traffic on Greetwell road plus further housing development there.</li> <li>2. GR and Dog kennel lane icy with several mortalities in winter months. .</li> <li>3. People need three roads to access shops, schooling and doctors surgeries.</li> <li>4. Right to use HR.</li> </ol>
258		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Time spent getting into Lincoln is worse by replacing roundabout on A158 with traffic lights.</li> <li>2. If HR closed most traffic will go through Fiskerton- Greetwell rd.</li> <li>3. Busier each year and dangerous in icy weather.</li> <li>4. Cost of Road Bridge negligible.</li> <li>5. Increased length of journey, more fuel and more CO2.</li> </ol>
259		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have to use Kennel lane, Greetwell Road.</li> <li>2. Concerns about Kennel lanes junction with A158 already dangerous with queues.</li> <li>3. Road safety issues at this junction already – not lit, no traffic signals.</li> <li>4. Main road between 2 villages. .</li> <li>5. Established right of way into village.</li> <li>6. Delays in journeys and more dangerous.</li> </ol>
260		non	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased congestion on Kennel Lane.</li> <li>2. Safety of Kennel Lane would require upgrade to road by removing the bends and providing traffic signals or a roundabout at the junction with the A158.</li> <li>3. Increased journey times and mileage.</li> </ol>
261		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fiskerton Road recently closed due to an accident and caused chaos in village with 'rat-running'.</li> <li>2. Village will become a 'rat-run'.</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane, Croft Lane, Church Lane and Waterford Lane are not adequate roads.</li> <li>4. Village will lose appeal of being a quiet village.</li> </ol>
262		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fiskerton Road recently closed due to an accident and caused chaos in village with 'rat-running'.</li> <li>2. Village will become a 'rat-run'.</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane, Croft Lane, Church Lane and Waterford Lane are not adequate roads.</li> <li>4. Village will lose appeal of being a quiet village.</li> </ol>
263		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fiskerton Road recently closed due to an accident and caused chaos in village with 'rat-running'.</li> <li>2. Village will become a 'rat-run'.</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane, Croft Lane, Church Lane and Waterford Lane are not adequate roads.</li> <li>4. Village will lose appeal of being a quiet village.</li> </ol>
264		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fiskerton Road recently closed due to an accident and caused chaos in village with 'rat-running'.</li> <li>2. Village will become a 'rat-run'.</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane, Croft Lane, Church Lane and Waterford Lane are not adequate roads.</li> <li>4. Village will lose appeal of being a quiet village.</li> </ol>
265		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Direct route onto Bunkers Hill and Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Alternatives require longer distance, longer journey times and greater cost.</li> <li>3. Save money from NMU bridge and rescue plans for Hawthorn Road bridge.</li> </ol>
266		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reasonable alternatives.</li> <li>2. NMU does not consider safety of users at LILO. PROW between A158 and NMU does not have a crossing point extended to the east to access NMU.</li> <li>3. Concerns about visibility sight lines around the corner coming towards the junction.</li> <li>4. Difference in Cost for road bridge is negligible in scheme and could be mitigated by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>5. Increased fuel costs, longer journeys in distance and time taken.</li> <li>6. No reliability for journey times.</li> <li>7. Increased impact on environment from</li> <li>8. Increased mileage.</li> <li>9. Not clear if considered the most recent housing developments that have been built since traffic surveys.</li> <li>10. Concerns about the LEB even before consideration if given to new housing development.</li> <li>11. Road bridge could be part of development strategy.</li> </ol>
267		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Complaint re procedure – sign placed in inadequate places. No information provided. Parish Councils not informed or consulted. .</li> <li>2. Alternatives are less safe which can be seen by number of accidents on these roads.</li> <li>3. If alternatives closed traffic will have to use one remaining route into and out of Cherry Willingham.</li> <li>4. Increased mileage and costs</li> <li>5. Increased journey times</li> <li>6. Impact on environment</li> <li>7. Increase in emergency services response times.</li> </ol>
268		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are less safe and suitable for traffic volume.</li> <li>2. Failure to consult on changes to the proposal (HR to remain open)</li> <li>3. Concerned about LEB ability to cope with existing volumes of traffic as a single carriageway.</li> <li>4. Traffic access A158 - will be through Cherry Willingham and along Kennel Lane.</li> <li>5. NMU plans don't consider safety of users where NMU meets LILO junction.</li> <li>6. PROW between A158 and NMU does not have a crossing point extended to the far east to access the NMU – safety of users.</li> <li>7. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and joining HR is concern when considering visibility sight lines. .</li> <li>8. Reliability of journeys will be lost.</li> <li>9. Closure will add to mileage, increasing petrol costs and journey times along with negative impact on environment.</li> <li>10. Increase in traffic leaving A158 endangering pupils crossing LEB.</li> </ol>
269		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes less safe and high number of accidents</li> <li>2. Traffic from new development will want to access A158 - only alternative if through Cherry Willingham and along Kennel Lane. Kennel Lane not suitable of volume of traffic now</li> <li>3. Increase in traffic if LEB built leaving A158 to drive along Kennel Lane and through Cherry Willingham. Past school and endangering pupils crossing the road to access LEB (south) at Greetwell Jct in order to avoid A15/A158 roundabout.</li> <li>4. Reliability of journey will be lost</li> <li>5. Cherry Willingham will no longer be safe for pedestrians.</li> </ol>
270		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are inadequate and less safe No reasonable alternative.</li> <li>2. Failed to consult with either of the parish councils or residents.</li> </ol>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Concerned about capacity of single carriageway to cope with existing volumes of traffic.</li> <li>4. New development – Increase in traffic wanting to access A158 – only alternative is through Cherry Willingham and alone Kennel Lane.</li> <li>5. NMU bridge does not consider safety of users where the NMU meets the LILO junction. PROW between A158 and NMU does not have a crossing point extended to the far east to access the NMU placing cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders in danger.</li> <li>6. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and joining Hawthorn Road is a concern where considered with the visibility sight lines around the corner.</li> <li>7. Reliability of journey will be lost.</li> <li>8. Increased mileage, increase petrol costs and journey times along with a negative impact on environment.</li> <li>9. Once LEB built increase in traffic leaving A158 to drive along Kennel Lane to access LEB at Greetwell junction in order to avoid A158.</li> <li>10. No viable public transport option.</li> </ol>
271		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Closures will reduce catchment of Cherry Willingham Community School area by half.</li> <li>2. Closes access to the school to all families on Lincoln side of the LEB.</li> <li>3. NMU and vehicle route more complex and increase in mileage pupils will attend other schools.</li> <li>4. Eastern Lincoln has potential for development which could impact positively on school numbers.</li> <li>5. Closure will stop growth opportunity for school. .</li> <li>6. Kennel lane unsuitable alternative. Improvement will not make any difference at bends or concealed entrance.</li> <li>7. A158 busy road to add in displaced Hawthorn Road traffic is risky and hazardous. Hawthorn Road/A158 junction already very busy.</li> <li>8. Safety of junction from a pedestrian point of view.</li> <li>9. Increased CO2 into environment from increase mileage. Cost of road bridge negligible in scheme and mitigated by removing LILO.</li> <li>10. Increased cost to local residents – fuel, care wear and tear, safety and accessibility</li> </ol>
272		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety of users where NMU meets LILO junction.</li> <li>2. PROW between A1578 and NMU does not have a crossing point extended to the far east</li> <li>3. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB huge concern relating to visibility sight lines.</li> <li>4. Result in increase in traffic through Cherry Willingham add to danger of villagers. Existing roads unsuitable.</li> <li>5. Increase traffic would feed into new roundabout on Fiskerton Road adding to increase in flow to North via Monks Road/Outercircle road junction.</li> <li>6. Cost of road bridge negligible in scheme and could be mitigated by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>7. Increased fuel bills cause by longer journeys both in distance and time taken.</li> <li>8. No reliability of journey times.</li> <li>9. Increase CO2 emissions.</li> <li>10. Taken into account recent housing developments that have been built since traffic surveys carried out.</li> <li>11. Concerns about capacity of LEB before consideration given to new housing development</li> <li>12.</li> </ol>
273		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety impact on village - increase in traffic flow through village.</li> <li>2. Alternative longer and not safe.</li> <li>3. Increase journey times and costs.</li> <li>4. Increased pollution.</li> <li>5. Concerned about emergency service response times.</li> </ol>
274		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of traditional access route.</li> <li>2. Increase in emergency times form alternative routes.</li> <li>3. Kennel lane onto A158 increased access cause traffic build up and delays. Could lead to driver frustration resulting in accidents. Unsuitable for large volumes of traffic.</li> <li>4. Fiskerton Road – vehicles drive through village to access lower Fiskerton road into Lincoln. Could lead to accidents.</li> <li>5. Traffic delays and build up will be caused by railway crossing combined with early morning flow of traffic inevitable an accident will occur.</li> <li>6. Concerns about cyclist and pedestrians.</li> <li>7. Increase in housing will aggravate points.</li> <li>8. Cost of Road Bridge trivial in scheme.</li> </ol>
275		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reasonable alternative.</li> <li>2. Safety of users where NMU meets LILO junction.</li> <li>3. PROW between A158 and NMU does not have a crossing point extended to the far east to access NMU – unsafe for cyclist and pedestrians.</li> <li>4. Costs of Road Bridge negligible in scheme and could be mitigated by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>5. No reliability of journey times.</li> <li>6. Increased CO2 emissions from extra mileage.</li> <li>7. Increased fuel costs.</li> <li>8. Concerns about capacity of LEB currently before consideration given to new housing development.</li> <li>9. NMU not fit for purpose.</li> </ol>
276		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inconvenience.</li> <li>2. Will put more traffic on A158 which at peak times is already difficult to access.</li> <li>3. Alternatives not suitable.</li> </ol>
277		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Procedure of LCC Safest route into Lincoln – alternatives have bends and dips and a number of accidents.</li> <li>2. Problems if Greetwell Road/Fiskerton Road or Kennel Lane closed.</li> <li>3. No access home if both roads are shut Access from Kennel Lane to Wragby Road difficult.</li> <li>4. More homes to be built will increase traffic flow.</li> <li>5. Will be more dangerous and difficult to get to school.</li> <li>6. Increase mileage, cost and journey times</li> <li>7. Negative impact on environment</li> <li>8. Increase in emergency response times.</li> </ol>
278		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LCC procedure</li> <li>2. Safest route - alternatives are less safe due to bends and dips particularly in winter or bad weather. Number of accidents.</li> <li>3. Closure of Greetwell Road/Fiskerton or Kennel Lane will increase traffic. No access home if both roads are shut.</li> <li>4. Difficult to get out on to Wragby Road from Kennel Lane.</li> </ol>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Increase in houses will increase traffic flow.</li> <li>6. Busy for school crossing and make more dangerous and difficult to get to school.</li> <li>7. Increase mileage, cost and journey times</li> <li>8. Negative impact on environment.</li> <li>9. Increase in emergency response times.</li> </ul>
279		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic on existing Fiskerton, Cherry Willingham and Lincoln Road. Already dangerous in winter.</li> <li>2. Will discourage people going to Lincoln</li> </ul>
280		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety of alternative. Increase chance of accidents.</li> <li>2. Increase length of journey and journey times</li> <li>3. Increase in cost of fuel</li> <li>4. Increase in length of journey for emergency services</li> </ul>
281		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety with increase in traffic</li> <li>2. Increase in travel time</li> <li>3. Increase in fuel costs</li> </ul>
282			
283		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe – including no pedestrian path. Numerous accidents on alternatives</li> <li>2. Cost of road bridge against NMU bridge is negligible.</li> <li>3. Increased mileage will have negative impact on environment.</li> <li>4. Increase in housing developments will increase traffic.</li> </ul>
284		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives do not provide same convenient access.</li> <li>2. Safety will be reduced due to increase in traffic and speed of vehicles leaving LEB</li> <li>3. Increase in fuel costs</li> <li>4. Increased carbon footprint</li> <li>5. Longer journeys and journey times</li> <li>6. Increase in car maintenance</li> </ul>
285		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase length of journey</li> <li>2. Increase fuel costs</li> <li>3. Increased pollution</li> <li>4. Alternatives are dangerous especially in winter</li> <li>5. Increase in emergency response times.</li> </ul>
286		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safest route</li> <li>2. No saving to tax payer</li> </ul>
287		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives don't match benefits of Hawthorn Road.</li> <li>2. Increase in length of journey</li> <li>3. Increase in fuel costs</li> </ul>
288		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access from Kennel lane onto Wragby Road.</li> <li>2. Increase in traffic</li> </ul>
289		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives routes are too small and dangerous for heaving traffic</li> <li>2. Journey longer and more congested</li> </ul>
290		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic on Fiskerton Road causing increase in accidents and possibly deaths.</li> </ul>
291		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety where NMU meets LILO.</li> <li>2. PROW between A158 and Hawthorn Road does not have a crossing point extended to the far east</li> <li>3. Cost of road bridge negligible in cost of scheme could be mitigated by removing LILO</li> <li>4. Loss of reliability in journeys</li> <li>5. Impact on environment</li> <li>6. Considered recent housing developments in traffic surveys</li> <li>7. Increase mileage</li> </ul>
292		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in fuel costs and travelling time</li> <li>2. Kennel lane not suitable - bends, problems in winter , access onto A158</li> <li>3. .Fiskerton Road via Church Lane or Waterford Lane – poor visibility from traffic emerging from Waterford lane. Fiskerton Road suffers water build up.</li> <li>4. Greetwell Hollow suffers from water run off</li> <li>5. Alternative routes are less safe</li> <li>6. Problems crossing roundabout where bypass traffic has priority</li> <li>7. Increase in greenhouse gasses</li> <li>8. Increase journey times</li> <li>9. LILO and alterations to other routes will costs less than road bridge.</li> <li>10. Lack of consultation for changes from road bridge</li> </ul>
293		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reasonable alternative route</li> <li>2. Increased cost</li> <li>3. Longer journey times</li> <li>4. Environment impact increased</li> <li>5. Kennel Lane – tight bends, difficult in bad weather difficult to access A158</li> <li>6. Fiskerton Road – greater volume of traffic going through Cherry Willingham less safe</li> </ul>
294			
295		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No reasonable convenient alternative</li> <li>2. Accidents on alternatives</li> <li>3. Safety of alternatives and use of A158</li> <li>4. Increase in journey times</li> <li>5. Increase in pollution</li> <li>6. Plans to increase population of village and surrounding areas but no plans to increase infrastructure</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			7. Negative impact on businesses and decrease in house prices
296		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Loss of most direct route – no reasonable alternative 2. Longer journey times 3. Increase in cost for increased mileage 4. Additional cost of roadbridge compared to NMU and LILO negligible in cost of scheme 5. Alternative routes are further, less direct and less safe 6. Traffic data out of date 7. Increase traffic through Cherry Willingham 8. Queues onto A158 9. Not clear if Impact of potential housing growth considered in traffic surveys
297		non	Append to Cherry Willingham Objection – no letter included
298		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Alternatives are longer, more costs less environmentally friendly 2. Hawthorn Road run into existing A46/A15 roundabout are
299		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Alternatives are longer, more costs less environmentally friendly 2. Hawthorn Road run into existing A46/A15 roundabout are
300		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road, 1. No safe alternative route unless Kennel Lane etc. are upgraded 2. Increased journey times and costs. 3. Concerns regarding junction at NMU/LILO, unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians, sight lines for both vehicles and pedestrians.
301		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Proposed NMU does not meet villages requirements and is an unsafe environment for pedestrians and cyclists. 2. Alternative routes are unsafe. 3. Argument against costs of NMU versus Road Bridge. 4. Concern over emergency services response times.
302		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Concerns regarding junction at NMU/LILO, unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians, sight lines for both vehicles and pedestrians. 2. Argument against costs of NMU versus Road Bridge. 3. Detriment to environment. 4. Housing growth not being considered. 5. Increase of traffic through village.
303		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Argument against costs of NMU versus Road Bridge. 2. Motorcycles could use NMU. 3. Housing growth not being considered. 4. Alternative routes not safe. 5. Extra volume of traffic through villages. 6. Increased journey times and costs. 7. Upgrades would need to be made to alternative routes to accommodate extra traffic usage.
304		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Loss of main route to Lincoln. 2. Alternative routes not adequate for major traffic volumes. 3. What would happen if Fiskerton Road is closed due to an accident? 4. Village will become a rat run for traffic.
305		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Alternative routes will not cope with traffic load. 2. Housing growth and School expansion/movement not being considered. 3. Argument against costs of NMU versus Road Bridge
306		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes are not safe. 2. Concern over emergency services response times.
307		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes are unsafe. 2. Increase in traffic through village especially if an accident on other routes. 3. Housing growth not considered. 4. LILO may be misused and dangerous. Illogical to turn left and double back. 5. Argument against costs of NMU. 6. Proposed NMU and LILO a danger to cyclists and pedestrians due to increase of speeds exiting the bypass. 7. Safety of cyclists a major issue.
308		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Increase in journey times and costs. 2. Fiskerton Road alternative route is longer, has dangerous bends, poorly lit and no cats eyes. 3. Argument against costs of NMU versus Road Bridge
309		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Alternative routes not viable and unsafe. 2. Housing growth not considered. 3. Increase of traffic through village. 4. Increased risk to pedestrians and cyclists. 5. Will cause even more diverted traffic with more delays, more congestion and Co2 emissions.
310		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158) 2. Increased congestion during summer periods. 3. Increased journey times and costs. 4. More pollution. 5. Alternative routes unsafe to use. 6. Argument against costs of NMU versus Road Bridge. 7. Being denied current access road to Lincoln.
311		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road. 1. Safety concerns 2. Argument against costs of NMU 3. Increase in journey times

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Detriment to environment</li> <li>5. Housing growth not being considered</li> <li>6. Personal inconvenience.</li> </ul>
312		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are unsafe.</li> </ul>
313		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of main route to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not adequate for major traffic volumes.</li> <li>3. What would happen if Fiskerton Road is closed due to an accident?</li> <li>4. Village will become a rat run for traffic.</li> </ul>
314		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns</li> <li>2. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158)</li> <li>3. Argument against costs of NMU</li> <li>4. Increase in journey times</li> <li>5. Detriment to environment</li> <li>6. Housing growth not being considered</li> <li>7. Personal inconvenience.</li> </ul>
315		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of direct route to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes are unsafe.</li> <li>3. Housing growth not considered.</li> <li>4. Village will become busier with traffic due to closure.</li> <li>5. Increase in carbon emissions.</li> <li>6. Increase in journey times.</li> <li>7. Cut off the community.</li> <li>8. Safety concerns.</li> <li>9. Need a road bridge not NMU.</li> </ul>
316		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>2. Housing growth not considered.</li> <li>3. Adjustments would need to be made to alternative routes to accommodate extra traffic usage.</li> </ul>
317		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Current NMU plans do not consider safety of users especially pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>2. Argument of costs for NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>3. Detrimental to environment.</li> <li>4. Housing growth not considered.</li> <li>5. Personal inconvenience.</li> <li>6. Increased traffic affecting travel times.</li> </ul>
318		non	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety of users using the NMU dismount and dash facility.</li> <li>2. No provision for cyclists using side roads from the villages.</li> <li>3. Closure of Hawthorn Road will increase traffic levels.</li> <li>4. Dangerous right turn over bridge on LEB for those cycling to Lincoln. Limited crossing points at junctions and over road.</li> </ul>
319		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not viable to take additional traffic.</li> <li>2. Housing growth not being considered.</li> </ul>
320			
321		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Longer journeys.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not suitable.</li> </ul>
322		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NMU no use for local residents, road bridge is needed.</li> <li>2. School numbers may be affected.</li> <li>3. Argument against costs of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>4. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>5. Housing growth needs to be considered.</li> <li>6. Predicted traffic flows understated.</li> <li>7. Mislead due to misinformation concerning road closure at council meetings.</li> </ul>
323		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Longer journey times.</li> <li>2. Kennel Lane – Wragby Road junction is already dangerous without the added pressure of more traffic.</li> <li>3. Congestion fears at junctions and roundabouts.</li> <li>4. Increase of traffic within local areas which further increases safety fears.</li> </ul>
324		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic through local vicinity, causing more congestion and accidents.</li> <li>2. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>3. Alternative routes less safe to travel on.</li> <li>4. Concern over emergency response times.</li> </ul>
325		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic will funnel onto already congested routes.</li> <li>2. Alternative route is dangerous.</li> <li>3. Road bridge should be considered or a roundabout or new section of road to join A158 at the roundabout west of North Greetwell</li> </ul>
326		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will increase taxi fares and public transport journey fees.</li> <li>2. Will increase costs and charge fees of the voluntary car drivers.</li> </ul>
327		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>2. Housing growth not being considered.</li> <li>3. Increase in journey times.</li> <li>4. Alternative routes are not safe.</li> <li>5. Does not meet stopping up criteria of being unnecessary or diverted to make it or more commodious.</li> </ul>
328		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Current plan overly complicated and not safe.</li> <li>2. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>3. Journey times will increase.</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Housing growth not considered.</li> <li>5. Emergency services use Hawthorn Road as it's a quicker option.</li> </ol>
329		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase traffic on alternative routes.</li> <li>2. Safety fears on Kennel Lane.</li> <li>3. Congestion fears in local areas due to closure.</li> <li>4. Concerns of safety of pedestrians on Kennel Lane (no Footpath)</li> </ol>
330		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerns of safety regarding LILLO junctions.</li> <li>2. Argument against costs of MNU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>3. Loss of direct route into Lincoln.</li> <li>4. Increased journey times and costs.</li> </ol>
331		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes are unsafe.</li> <li>3. Future housing growth not being considered.</li> <li>4. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>5. Concerns over the safety of the LILLO junction due to heavy traffic loads .</li> <li>6. Increase in journey times and costs.</li> </ol>
332		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will prevent vital direct access to the local hospice facility.</li> <li>2. Contradicts LCC aim to design better ways to provide essential health and social care services in the community due to delay in care delivery and access to facilities.</li> <li>3. Alternative routes are longer in journey times and will increase the suffering of patients.</li> <li>4. Patient visits could be lost due to increase of costs and extra journey times.</li> <li>5. Scheme should reflect the needs of the public.</li> </ol>
333		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prevent direct access to place of Work.</li> <li>2. Need direct route to help maintain care for Disabled Husband.</li> <li>3. Alternative routes will increase journey times and could have impact on employment status (due to personal arrangements to care for husband)</li> <li>4. Argument against costs of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>5. Traffic will be diverted though villages.</li> <li>6. Future housing growth not considered. .</li> </ol>
334		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158).</li> <li>2. Increased journey times and cost.</li> <li>3. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>4. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>5. New development not being considered.</li> <li>6. Detriment to the environment.</li> </ol>
335		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Argument against NMU costs versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>2. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>3. Would be forced to use alternative routes that are already gridlocked.</li> </ol>
336		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of traditional access.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not capable of taking increased traffic load.</li> <li>3. Housing growth not considered.</li> </ol>
337		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of traditional access.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not capable of taking increased traffic load.</li> <li>3. Housing growth not considered.</li> </ol>
338		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of traditional route to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158).</li> <li>3. Increased journey times and cost.</li> <li>4. Alternative routes not safe. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road bridge.</li> <li>5. New development not being considered.</li> <li>6. Detriment to the environment.</li> </ol>
339		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of traditional route to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158).</li> <li>3. Increased journey times and cost.</li> <li>4. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>5. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>6. New development not being considered.</li> <li>7. Detriment to the environment.</li> </ol>
340		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of traditional route to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158).</li> <li>3. Increased journey times and cost.</li> <li>4. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>5. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>6. New development not being considered.</li> <li>7. Detriment to the environment.</li> </ol>
341		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of traditional route to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158).</li> <li>3. Increased journey times and cost.</li> <li>4. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>5. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>6. New development not being considered.</li> <li>7. Detriment to the environment.</li> </ol>
342		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerns over emergency services response times.</li> </ol>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>3. Village infrastructure is insufficient to deal with extra volume of traffic.</li> <li>4. Safety concerns.</li> </ul>
343		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are not safe to use.</li> <li>2. Alternative route more susceptible to wintry considered</li> </ul>
344		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158)</li> <li>2. Extra volume of traffic on alternative routes will lead to more accidents.</li> <li>3. Argument against cost of MNU against Road Bridge.</li> <li>4. Local community will be isolated.</li> <li>5. Increase in journey times and costs.</li> <li>6. Increased pollution for area.</li> <li>7. Housing growth not being considered.</li> </ul>
345		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158)</li> <li>2. Extra volume of traffic on alternative routes will lead to more accidents.</li> <li>3. Argument against cost of MNU against Road Bridge.</li> <li>4. Local community will be isolated.</li> <li>5. Increase in journey times and costs.</li> <li>6. Increased pollution for area.</li> <li>7. Housing growth not being considered.</li> </ul>
346		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158)</li> <li>2. Extra volume of traffic on alternative routes will lead to more accidents.</li> <li>3. Argument against cost of NMU against Road Bridge.</li> <li>4. Local community will be isolated.</li> <li>5. Increase in journey times and costs.</li> <li>6. Increased pollution for area.</li> <li>7. Housing growth not being considered.</li> </ul>
347		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158)</li> <li>2. Extra volume of traffic on alternative routes will lead to more accidents.</li> <li>3. Argument against cost of MNU against Road Bridge.</li> <li>4. Local community will be isolated.</li> <li>5. Increase in journey times and costs.</li> <li>6. Increased pollution for area.</li> <li>7. Housing growth not being considered.</li> </ul>
348		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>2. Will cut off villager's bloodline to Lincoln.</li> </ul>
349		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are not safe to use. Hawthorn Road is direct access to Carlton Retail Park.</li> <li>2. Increased journey times and costs. Will increase accidents.</li> </ul>
350		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Housing growth not being considered.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not safe to use.</li> <li>3. Will affect families doing the school run.</li> <li>4. Concern over emergency services response times.</li> </ul>
351		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of direct route to amenities.</li> <li>2. Increase in traffic through village.</li> <li>3. Housing growth not considered.</li> </ul>
352		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New development not considered.</li> <li>2. Increase in traffic.</li> <li>3. Alternative routes not as safe.</li> </ul>
353		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158)</li> <li>2. Increase in journey times and costs.</li> <li>3. Could impact on school numbers.</li> <li>4. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>5. Congestion increased on these routes.</li> </ul>
354		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will lose main/direct route to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>3. Will put extra pressure on alternative routes which are already busy.</li> </ul>
355		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extra traffic being forced through Cherry Willingham.</li> <li>2. Increased traffic and potentially more accidents.</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane already unable to cope with the existing vehicle numbers.</li> <li>4. Argument against costs of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> </ul>
356		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of main route to Lincoln and daily school run.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>3. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>4. Housing growth not being considered.</li> </ul>
357		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased safety risk due to increased volume of traffic having to use the A158.</li> <li>2. A158/Kennel Lane junction already dangerous to enter and exit.</li> </ul>
358		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lose traditional access to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Will increase traffic along resident's road.</li> <li>3. Hawthorn Road is mainly used when diversions are required.</li> <li>4. Concerned for safety of pedestrians especially school children.</li> </ul>
359		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lose traditional access to Lincoln.</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>3. Concern regarding emergency response times.</li> <li>4. Concerned safety of students re. impact of increased traffic around school areas</li> </ul>
360		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Congestion fears.</li> <li>2. Schools will be cut off.</li> <li>3. Alternative routes not viable or safe.</li> <li>4. Effect on businesses and community.</li> </ul>
361		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safest access to amenities.</li> <li>2. Congestion and increase in waiting times along other routes.</li> <li>3. Greetwell road junction will not cope with extra volumes traffic.</li> <li>4. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road bridge</li> <li>5. Kennel Lane not a viable alternative.</li> </ul>
362		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in journey times and cost.</li> <li>2. Increase in response times for the emergency services to reach Cherry Willingham.</li> <li>3. Greater congestion on the roads.</li> </ul>
363		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of direct route to Lincoln</li> <li>2. Alternative route not safe.</li> <li>3. Housing growth not considered.</li> <li>4. Concerns about capacity of proposed bypass.</li> </ul>
364		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic from other villages through Cherry Willingham.</li> <li>2. Housing growth not being considered.</li> </ul>
365		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cuts off direct route to Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Puts further pressure on alternative routes.</li> <li>3. Concerns about accessing emergency services.</li> <li>4. Congestion fears.</li> <li>5. Argument towards cost of Road bridge with little adjustment to proposal.</li> <li>6. Villages will become isolated.</li> </ul>
366		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>2. Longer journey to amenities.</li> </ul>
367		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believe the junction will be unsafe (NMU bridge and A158).</li> <li>2. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>3. Congestion fears on new bypass.</li> <li>4. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>5. Traffic modelling used was unsound being from 2006.</li> <li>6. Detrimental to environment.</li> <li>7. Housing growth not being taken into account.</li> <li>8. Personal inconvenience.</li> </ul>
368		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are not safe.</li> <li>2. Hawthorn Road is direct access to amenities.</li> <li>3. Congestion fears.</li> <li>4. Increased journey times and costs.</li> </ul>
369		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes not safe.</li> <li>2. Argument against cost of NMU versus Road Bridge.</li> <li>3. Increased journey times.</li> <li>4. New growth not considered.</li> </ul>
370		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns of alternative routes.</li> <li>2. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>3. No direct access to amenities.</li> </ul>
371		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>2. Believe the new junction will be unsafe and impossible to join with amount of traffic.</li> <li>3. Current junctions will not cope with extra traffic load.</li> <li>4. Future development not being taken into consideration.</li> </ul>
372		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are not safe.</li> <li>2. Concerns about response times for emergency services.</li> <li>3. Traffic will be forced through Cherry Willingham.</li> <li>4. More traffic will generated through future development.</li> <li>5. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>6. Increase traffic on other routes.</li> </ul>
373		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Main access route to and from Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Increased journey times and costs.</li> <li>3. Concern for pedestrians due to increased traffic through villages.</li> <li>4. To construct a road bridge at a marginal extra cost.</li> </ul>
374		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety concerns, alternative routes not safe</li> <li>2. Poor visibility at LILO</li> <li>3. No added protection for cyclists on alternative routes</li> <li>4. Argument against costs of NMU</li> <li>5. Detrimental to the environment.</li> <li>6. Will affect small businesses.</li> </ul>
375		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Longer journey times along alternative routes which are not as safe.</li> </ul>
376		non	<p>Standard Letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>lines</li> <li>2. Cost of road bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. Increase in fuel costs for road users. Loss of journey time reliability.</li> <li>3. 300 families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> <li>4. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy.</li> <li>5. Longer journey means additional 438 miles per year.</li> </ul>
377		non	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safe access lost which is not replaced by alternative routes.</li> <li>2. Longer journey to Tesco</li> <li>3. Longer journey to Carlton Centre.</li> <li>4. Longer journeys as part of umpire duties.</li> <li>5. Fiskerton Road prone to ice and fog.</li> <li>6. Turning in/out of Kennel Lane dangerous at each end.</li> </ul>
378		non	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additional traffic through CW via Fiskerton Road.</li> <li>2. Prone to ice at s bends. Will lead to more fatalities.</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane too narrow and exit on to A158 dangerous.</li> <li>4. Parking on Kennel Lane makes use unsafe.</li> <li>5. Increased response times for emergency services.</li> </ul>
379		non	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased traffic flow on Kennel Lane makes crossing it at Reepham end unacceptable.</li> <li>2. No consultation on proposal to close HR. Decision was sneaked through.</li> <li>3. Will impact on lift share as sharer lives at Carlton centre.</li> <li>4. Additional journey distance to supermarkets etc.</li> <li>5. Proposals for 900 houses at CW would add to problem.</li> <li>6. Extended response times for emergency services.</li> <li>7. Cost of Road Bridge negligible relative to overall scheme cost.</li> <li>8. Cost of PI could have paid for Road Bridge.</li> </ul>
380		non	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes inconvenient and increase journey distance and pollution.</li> <li>2. Increased journey times for emergency services. Will cause stress to high number of elderly residents E of Lincoln.</li> <li>3. Concerns over use of alternative routes in winter.</li> <li>4. Need safe and direct link for proposed developments in area, particularly to shops.</li> <li>5. Higher traffic flows in summer.</li> <li>6. Cost of Road Bridge negligible in overall scheme cost.</li> <li>7. LEB needs dualling using funds from Autumn Statement</li> </ul>
381		non	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PI will cost more than Road Bridge.</li> <li>2. Increased commuting distance.</li> <li>3. Increased fuel costs</li> <li>4. Increase in CO2 emissions.</li> <li>5. Alternative routes not safe in winter.</li> <li>6. Increased response times for emergency services.</li> </ul>
382		non	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will increase traffic through CW via Croft Lane and Fiskerton Road. Junction of those roads is unsafe.</li> <li>2. Increase in congestion at Wickes junction.</li> <li>3. Greetwell Road unsafe especially in bad weather.</li> <li>4. Closure of alternative routes due to accidents will cause traffic chaos.</li> <li>5. Additional housing proposals and proposed marina will increase traffic through CW.</li> <li>6. A158\Kennel Lane junction unsuitable.</li> <li>7. Not safe for pedestrians to use Church Lane in CW due to increase in traffic.</li> </ul>
383		non	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Goes against wishes of residents.</li> <li>2. Increase in travel time and distance.</li> <li>3. Additional traffic on unsafe alternative routes.</li> <li>4. Contradicts Council's policies on environment and safety.</li> </ul>
384		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. Increase in fuel costs for road users. Loss of journey time reliability.</li> <li>3. 300 families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 extra miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> <li>4. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy.</li> </ul>
385		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. Increase in fuel costs for road users. Loss of journey time reliability.</li> <li>3. 300 families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> <li>4. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road Bridge could be part of a development strategy.</li> <li>5. Alternative routes unsafe in winter.</li> </ul>
386		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic through CW.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes unsafe.</li> <li>3. Wickes roundabout already congested.</li> <li>4. Greetwell Road unsafe especially in winter.</li> <li>5. Waterford Lane in CW not safe which will be alternative route.</li> <li>6. Kennel Lane not safe.</li> <li>7. A158\Kennel Lane junction not suitable.</li> <li>8. Parking issues on Kennel Lane.</li> <li>9. Increased response time for emergency services.</li> <li>10. Reduced access to schools.</li> <li>11. Change made surreptitiously</li> </ul>
387		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic through CW.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes unsafe.</li> <li>3. Wickes roundabout already congested.</li> <li>4. Greetwell Road unsafe especially in winter.</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Kennel Lane not safe.</li> <li>6. A158\Kennel Lane junction not suitable.</li> <li>7. Parking issues on Kennel Lane.</li> <li>8. Increased response time for emergency services.</li> </ul>
388		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incidents on Fiskerton Road lead to traffic congestion.</li> <li>2. Access to Carlton Centre and CW schools restricted</li> <li>3. Proposed 900 additional houses in CW not reflected in the current traffic modelling.</li> <li>4. LEB will be at capacity on opening. Closure will lead to further congestion.</li> <li>5. Main route to hospital will be via Greetwell Road which is unsafe.</li> <li>6. Increased flows at Fiskerton Road rbt.</li> <li>7. Road between Fiskerton and Bardney in poor condition.</li> </ul>
389		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additional cost of Road Bridge is negligible when compared to benefits.</li> <li>2. Wrong to close when CW is expanding.</li> </ul>
390		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Infrastructure of villages will not cope with increased traffic.</li> <li>2. 2000 homes proposed at end of Greetwell Road.</li> <li>3. Marina proposed at CW will add to problems.</li> </ul>
391		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will increase traffic on other roads.</li> <li>2. Increased fuel costs</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane\A158 junction hazardous</li> <li>4. Increased response times for emergency services.</li> </ul>
392		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased travel distances and thus more fuel costs.</li> <li>2. Greetwell Road unsafe</li> <li>3. Cost of road bridge negligible relative to overall scheme cost</li> <li>4. Additional proposed housing will not be possible</li> </ul>
393		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kennel Lane and Greetwell Road unsafe.</li> <li>2. GR prone to flooding</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane\A158 junction unsuitable.</li> <li>4. Increase in travel distance adds cost.</li> <li>5. Closure is underhand.</li> </ul>
394		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kennel Lane unsuitable</li> </ul>
395		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILLO junction. Increase in fuel costs for road users. Loss of journey time reliability.</li> <li>3. 300 families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> <li>4. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy.</li> <li>5. Increase in response times for ambulances.</li> </ul>
396		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsuitable</li> <li>2. Large volumes of traffic on LEB will deter use of LILLO junction.</li> <li>3. Will be difficult to cross roundabout on GR because of high traffic volumes leading to excessive queuing on approaches.</li> <li>4. Cost of road bridge could be covered by removing NMU bridge and LILLO</li> <li>5. Increased journey times and additional fuel costs.</li> </ul>
397		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsuitable</li> <li>2. Large volumes of traffic on LEB will deter use of LILLO junction.</li> <li>3. Will be difficult to cross roundabout on GR because of high traffic volumes leading to excessive queuing on approaches.</li> <li>4. Cost of road bridge could be covered by removing NMU bridge and LILLO</li> <li>5. Increased journey times.</li> <li>6. Marina and proposed additional housing will increase traffic</li> </ul>
398		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives are inadequate and less safe</li> <li>2. Underhand manner of changing scheme</li> <li>3. Lack of consultation</li> <li>4. Issues with LILLO due to speed and volume of vehicles on LEB. Will lead to queuing.</li> <li>5. Plans for several hundred houses on HR. this traffic will have to head south to use GR rbt and then travel north. Additional traffic on Kennel Lane.</li> <li>6. Fiskerton road unsafe.</li> <li>7. Increased travel distance and journey times leading to increased fuel costs. Negative impact on environment.</li> <li>8. NMU route along HR becomes inadequate and will deter use.</li> <li>9. High speed of vehicles existing LEB on to HR.</li> <li>10. Concern over visibility sight lines.</li> <li>11. Increase in traffic through CW. No school crossing patrol.</li> </ul>
399		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives are inadequate and less safe</li> <li>2. Underhand manner of changing scheme</li> <li>3. Lack of consultation</li> <li>4. Issues with LILLO due to speed and volume of vehicles on LEB. Will lead to queuing.</li> <li>5. Plans for several hundred houses on HR. this traffic will have to head south to use GR rbt and then travel north. Additional traffic on Kennel Lane.</li> <li>6. Fiskerton road unsafe.</li> <li>7. Increased travel distance and journey times leading to increased fuel costs. Negative impact on environment.</li> <li>8. NMU route along HR becomes inadequate and will deter use.</li> <li>9. High speed of vehicles existing LEB on to HR.</li> <li>10. Concern over visibility sight lines.</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			11. Increase in traffic through CW. No school crossing patrol.
400		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increased travel distances will increase costs and thus affect quality of life. 2. Reduction in access to services 3. Divides communities 4. Will strangle Lincoln. Reduces route choice for users in and out of city. Reduces route choice for emergency services. 5. Cost of road bridge could be covered by removing NMU bridge and LILO 6. Process not transparent or truthful
401		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Trip to CW would need to be via Nth Greetwell. 2. HR\Bunkers Hill junction inadequate. 3. Outer Circle Road congested. 4. Villages cut off and businesses affected.
402		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Kennel Lane\A158 junction difficult to turn right out of. Additional traffic will make this worse.
403		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Kennel Lane\A158 junction difficult to use. Additional traffic will make this worse. 2. HR used for a lot of reasons. 3. Increase in pollution
404		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines 2. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. Increase in fuel costs for road users. Loss of journey time reliability. 3. 300 families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced. 4. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy. 5. Longer journey means additional 438 miles per year. 6. Increase in response times for ambulances.
405		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Longer journey times 2. Increased travel cost 3. Increased personal risk 4. Greetwell Road unsafe 5. CW junctions on to Fiskerton Road unsafe. 6. Greetwell Road will have to give way to LEB at new roundabout. 7. Kennel Lane unsafe. Junction with A158 too busy to use. 8. Journey time reliability reduced
406		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increase in traffic on Kennel Lane. Junctions are inadequate at each end. Road is unsafe. 2. Increase in traffic through CW. 3. Marina will increase traffic on Fiskerton Road. 4. Cost of Road Bridge small relative to overall scheme cost.
407		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Alternative routes are considerably less safe 2. Alternative routes will become more congested with current and future expansion 3. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. Increase in fuel costs for road users. Loss of journey time reliability. 4. Value for money elements not fully considered.
408		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Alternative routes inconvenient and increase journey distance and pollution. 2. Increased journey times for emergency services. Will cause stress to high number of elderly residents E of Lincoln. 3. Concerns over use of alternative routes in winter. 4. Need safe and direct link for proposed developments in area, particularly to shops. 5. Higher traffic flows in summer. 6. Cost of road bridge negligible in overall scheme cost. 7. LEB needs dualling using funds from Autumn Statement
409		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines 2. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. Increase in fuel costs for road users. 3. Loss of journey time reliability. 4. 300 families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced. 5. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy. 6. Longer journey means additional 438 miles per year. 7. Increase in response times for ambulances.
410		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines 2. Cost of road bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. 3. Increase in fuel costs for road users. 4. Loss of journey time reliability. 5. 300 families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 extra miles. 6. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy. 7. Longer journey means additional 438 miles per year.
411		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increase in traffic through villages will lead to safety issues 2. Will limit new development in villages 3. Cost of road bridge needs to be weighed against safety

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
412		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Alternative routes are less safe, particularly during winter</li> <li>3. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>4. Increase in fuel costs for road users.</li> <li>5. Loss of journey time reliability.</li> <li>6. 300 families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> <li>7. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy.</li> </ol>
413		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of journey time reliability.</li> <li>2. Increase in fuel costs</li> <li>3. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy.</li> <li>4. Closure hinders development</li> <li>5. Alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>6. Loss of connection to hospice and schools and facilities</li> </ol>
414		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unacceptable.</li> <li>2. Increase in traffic through CW introduces safety issues</li> <li>3. Potential development in CW will increase traffic and hence congestion including at Wickes roundabout.</li> <li>4. Kennel Lane\A158 junction congested\unsafe</li> <li>5. Lack of consultation</li> <li>6. Traffic\NMU surveys inadequate</li> </ol>
415		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsafe in winter</li> <li>2. Traffic forced to use A158 which is unsafe</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane\A158 junction not safe particularly to turn right out of. Will get worse with additional traffic. Likely to require works to improve which could be spent on road bridge</li> <li>4. Closure of HR will have a wider impact on city than predicted</li> <li>5. Increase in response times for emergency services</li> <li>6. Danger to equestrians in CW due to extra traffic</li> <li>7. Cost of Road Bridge could be covered by removal of NMU and LILO</li> <li>8. Makes bus usage less attractive</li> <li>9. Proposed housing not taken into account</li> </ol>
416		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Longer journey times</li> <li>2. Increased travel cost</li> <li>3. Increased personal risk</li> <li>4. Greetwell Road unsafe</li> <li>5. CW junctions on to Fiskerton Road unsafe.</li> <li>6. Greetwell Road will have to give way to LEB at new roundabout.</li> <li>7. Kennel Lane unsafe. Junction with A158 too busy to use.</li> </ol>
417		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of social and economic benefits</li> <li>2. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>3. Increased journey times and transport costs</li> <li>4. Loss of school choice</li> </ol>
418		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in travel distance and journey time</li> <li>2. Increase in risk of accidents</li> <li>3. Personal economic and environmental impact</li> <li>4. All traffic will divert on to GR. Wickes roundabout already congested</li> <li>5. GR unsafe</li> <li>6. Closure will deter NMU use on GR</li> <li>7. Possible housing will increase traffic</li> <li>8. Inaccurate traffic modelling</li> <li>9. No analysis of purpose or nature of journeys</li> <li>10. HR is a major artery</li> </ol>
419		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives are inadequate and less safe</li> <li>2. Underhand manner of changing scheme</li> <li>3. Lack of consultation</li> <li>4. Issues with LILO due to speed and volume of vehicles on LEB. Will lead to queuing.</li> <li>5. Plans for several hundred houses on HR. this traffic will have to head south to use GR rbt and then travel north. Additional traffic on Kennel Lane.</li> <li>6. Fiskerton road unsafe.</li> <li>7. Increased travel distance and journey times leading to increased fuel costs. Negative impact on environment.</li> <li>8. NMU route along HR becomes inadequate and will deter use.</li> <li>9. High speed of vehicles existing LEB on to HR.</li> <li>10. Concern over visibility sight lines.</li> <li>11. Increase in traffic through CW. No school crossing patrol.</li> </ol>
420		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives are inadequate and less safe</li> <li>2. Underhand manner of changing scheme</li> <li>3. Lack of consultation</li> <li>4. Issues with LILO due to speed and volume of vehicles on LEB. Will lead to queuing.</li> <li>5. Plans for several hundred houses on HR. this traffic will have to head south to use GR rbt and then travel north. Additional traffic on Kennel Lane.</li> <li>6. Fiskerton road unsafe.</li> <li>7. Increased travel distance and journey times leading to increased fuel costs. Negative impact on environment.</li> <li>8. NMU route along HR becomes inadequate and will deter use.</li> <li>9. High speed of vehicles existing LEB on to HR.</li> <li>10. Concern over visibility sight lines.</li> <li>11. Increase in traffic through CW. No school crossing patrol.</li> </ol>
421		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives are inadequate and less safe</li> </ol>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Underhand manner of changing scheme</li> <li>3. Lack of consultation</li> <li>4. Issues with LILLO due to speed and volume of vehicles on LEB. Will lead to queuing.</li> <li>5. Plans for several hundred houses on HR. this traffic will have to head south to use GR rbt and then travel north. Additional traffic on Kennel Lane.</li> <li>6. Fiskerton road unsafe.</li> <li>7. Increased travel distance and journey times leading to increased fuel costs. Negative impact on environment.</li> <li>8. NMU route along HR becomes inadequate and will deter use.</li> <li>9. High speed of vehicles existing LEB on to HR.</li> <li>10. Concern over visibility sight lines.</li> <li>11. Increase in traffic through CW. No school crossing patrol.</li> </ul>
422		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of consultation</li> <li>2. Access to Carlton centre reduced</li> <li>3. Wragby road and GR roundabouts will be congested</li> <li>4. Kennel Lane\A158 junction difficult to use due to traffic volumes</li> <li>5. Kennel lane jctn in village is unsafe</li> <li>6. Kennel lane unsafe because of bends</li> <li>7. Increase in traffic in CW</li> <li>8. Increase in journey is unsustainable</li> <li>9. Impact on travel to school</li> <li>10. Increase in emissions</li> <li>11. Traffic surveys not carried out at peak times</li> </ul>
423		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need to consider proposed expansion of villages</li> <li>2. Impact on safety and quality of living</li> </ul>
424		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Important access to Carlton centre</li> <li>2. Safety issues in village</li> <li>3. Increase in traffic passing community school</li> <li>4. Against LCC policy of encouraging walking to school</li> <li>5. Reduction in pupil numbers could close school</li> <li>6. Alternative routes are unsafe</li> <li>7. Increase in traffic in CW</li> </ul>
425		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kennel lane unsafe</li> <li>2. A158 has high volume during summer</li> <li>3. Fiskerton Rd unsafe</li> <li>4. No NMU provision on Fiskerton Rd</li> </ul>
426		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsafe in winter</li> <li>2. Impact on emergency services</li> </ul>
427		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Alternative routes are less safe, particularly during winter</li> <li>3. Increased response times for emergency services</li> <li>4. Cost of road bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILLO junction.</li> <li>5. Increase in fuel costs for road users.</li> <li>6. Loss of journey time reliability.</li> <li>7. 300 families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> <li>8. Longer journey means additional 438 miles per year.</li> </ul>
428		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic through CW</li> <li>2. Increase in delays on to Fiskerton Rd</li> <li>3. Wickes rbt congested already will only get worse</li> <li>4. Fiskerton Rd unsafe in winter</li> <li>5. Impact on NMU in CW</li> <li>6. Increased journey times</li> <li>7. Increase in fuel usage and pollution</li> </ul>
429		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disruption not justified by relatively limited cost savings</li> <li>2. Increase in traffic on alternative routes</li> <li>3. Wickes rbt is already congested</li> <li>4. GR unsafe</li> <li>5. kennel lane\A158 junction unsafe</li> <li>6. LILLO does not provide adequate solution</li> </ul>
430		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GR is congested</li> <li>2. Additional traffic will further congest Wickes rbt and back up across LEB</li> <li>3. Need to segregate bypass and commuter traffic</li> <li>4. Will introduce journey delays and reduce safety</li> <li>5. Conduct of LCC during planning process needs considering. Inadequate consultation</li> <li>6. Inaccurate records of existing road network</li> <li>7. Not fit for purpose</li> <li>8. Misleading presentation of information</li> <li>9. Inadequate investigation of impacts on residents</li> </ul>
431			
432		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are unsafe</li> <li>2. Wickes rbt congested</li> <li>3. Increased response times for emergency services</li> <li>4. Joining LEB from HR not safe</li> <li>5. Increased journey distance and travel times</li> <li>6. A158 has high traffic volumes</li> <li>7. Kennel Lane unsafe</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Increase in traffic through CW</li> <li>9. Impact on journey time reliability</li> <li>10. Increase in pollution</li> <li>11. Future housing not taken into consideration</li> <li>12. Cost of road bridge covered by removing NMU and LILO</li> <li>13. Increased fuel costs</li> </ul>
433		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Cost of road bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>3. Community severance</li> <li>4. Kennel Lane\A158 junction unsafe</li> </ul>
434		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>2. Cost of road bridge covered by removing NMU and LILO</li> </ul>
435		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsafe. A158 is already a 'red route'.</li> <li>2. Kennel Lane\A158 junction needs improving</li> <li>3. Increased journey times and travel distance</li> <li>4. Impact on emergency services</li> <li>5. Increased fuel costs and travel times will impact business</li> <li>6. Cost of road bridge covered by removing NMU and LILO</li> </ul>
436		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduced access to Carlton centre and bunkers hill causes personal inconvenience</li> <li>2. Alternative routes longer and thus take more time and more expensive</li> <li>3. Alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>4. Proposed housing growth will increase impacts</li> </ul>
437		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic through CW</li> <li>2. Wickes rbt has high traffic volumes</li> <li>3. GR unsafe in winter</li> <li>4. Kennel lane unsuitable</li> <li>5. Kennel Lane\A158 junction unsuitable</li> <li>6. Increased response time for emergency services</li> </ul>
438		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>2. Wickes rbt already congested additional traffic will make worse</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn unsuitable</li> </ul>
439		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. scooter use unsafe on alternative routes</li> </ul>
440		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. increased travel distance to facilities</li> <li>2. alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>3. increased fuel costs</li> <li>4. traffic surveys showing destinations inaccurate</li> <li>5. suggestion that Carlton estate is a rat run is inaccurate</li> </ul>
441		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>3. Increase in fuel costs for road users.</li> <li>4. Loss of journey time reliability.</li> <li>5. Families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> <li>6. Rumoured housing growth along HR not considered in traffic modelling. HR should be part of development strategy</li> <li>7. Effect on wellbeing</li> </ul>
442		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic through CW</li> <li>2. Wickes rbt has high traffic volumes</li> <li>3. GR unsafe in winter</li> <li>4. Kennel lane unsuitable. Also parking issues</li> <li>5. Kennel Lane\A158 junction unsuitable</li> <li>6. Increased response time for emergency services</li> </ul>
443		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Widespread local opposition</li> <li>2. Increased travel distances exacerbated by frequency of travel</li> <li>3. Increase in traffic along Kennel Lane</li> <li>4. Increase in traffic through CW</li> <li>5. Traffic modelling should not be given similar weight as at previous PI</li> <li>6. Traffic impacts not assessed robustly. Also at odds with local knowledge.</li> <li>7. Additional housing proposals not included in forecasts</li> <li>8. Impact of seasonal holiday traffic on A158 over longer period than peak</li> <li>9. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. LCC accept this?</li> <li>10. Alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>11. Safety of locals has been traded for wider safety benefits of LEB</li> <li>12. Increased pollution of at least 65 tonnes per year, possibly increasing to 100 tonnes per year.</li> <li>13. Inadequate consultation accepted by LCC</li> </ul>
444			
445		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in journey times and fuel bills</li> <li>2. Alternative routes will become dangerous and congested</li> <li>3. Single c\way scheme will give smaller traffic benefits</li> <li>4. Needs dualling</li> <li>5. Speed of vehicles joining HR</li> <li>6. Safety of NMU</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
446		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Fiskerton Road becoming unsafe 2. Fiskerton Road blocked in winter 3. Kennel Lane\A158 junction unsuitable 4. Increase in traffic on Kennel Lane 5. Forced to use A158\Kennel Lane 6. Partial NMU provision on Fiskerton Road
447		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Impact on schools, potential reduction in pupil numbers 2. Economic impact on villages 3. Impacts not considered in ES 4. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. LILO unnecessary 5. Increased travel distances and journey times and thus fuel costs 6. Increase in pollution 7. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines 8. Outdated traffic surveys as significant residential and commercial development in the area. Exacerbated by potential future growth 9. Increase in traffic through CW
448		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Impact on schools, potential reduction in pupil numbers 2. Economic impact on villages 3. Impacts not considered in ES 4. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. LILO unnecessary 5. Increased travel distances and journey times and thus fuel costs 6. Increase in pollution 7. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines 8. Outdated traffic surveys as significant residential and commercial development in the area. Exacerbated by potential future growth 9. Increase in traffic through CW 10. Undermines aspirations of CW Neighbourhood Plan
449		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increased travel distance 2. Proposed growth not taken into account 3. Major historic route
450		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increased journey time and thus travel costs 2. Additional energy use and pollution 3. Increased traffic on alternative routes 4. Alternative routes unsafe 5. Increased traffic through CW. Reduction in safety for schools 6. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines 7. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. 8. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy.
451		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increased travel distance and journey time 2. Kennel Lane unsafe 3. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. 4. 300 families use HR daily to take children to school. Exacerbated by future growth plans. 5. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent or future development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. 6. Should be dualled 7. GR unsafe
452		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines 2. Alternative routes unsafe 3. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. 4. Increase in fuel costs and pollution for road users. 5. Potential reduction in pupil numbers could result in school closures
453		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines 2. GR congested and unsafe. 3. Increased response times for emergency services. 4. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. 5. Increase in fuel costs for road users. 6. Loss of journey time reliability. 7. 300+ families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500+ cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced. Against LCC and national policy to reduce carbon footprint. 8. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy. 9. Longer journey means additional 438 miles per year.
454		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increase in traffic through CW 2. Alternative route is already congested
455			
456		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Longer journey times 2. Increased travel cost 3. Increased personal risk

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Greetwell Road unsafe</li> <li>5. CW junctions on to Fiskerton Road unsafe.</li> <li>6. Greetwell Road will have to give way to LEB at new roundabout.</li> <li>7. Kennel Lane unsafe. Junction with A158 too busy to use.</li> <li>8. Journey time reliability</li> </ul>
457		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic on Greetwell Road which is unsafe in winter</li> <li>2. Risk of personal injury on GR</li> </ul>
458		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GR unsafe</li> <li>2. Roundabouts create congestion and should be replaced by flyovers</li> <li>3. Will damage village economy</li> <li>4. Will increase congestion</li> </ul>
459		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kennel Lane unsafe</li> <li>2. Increased in travel distance and thus travel costs</li> <li>3. Roundabout or traffic lights required at Kennel Lane\A158 junction</li> </ul>
460		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in travel distance and thus travel costs.</li> <li>2. Increase in pollution and reduction in carbon footprint</li> <li>3. GR congested</li> <li>4. Kennel Lane unsafe</li> <li>5. Increase in traffic through CW</li> </ul>
461		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>2. Difference in cost between bridges is relatively small</li> <li>3. Increased fuel costs and journey time</li> </ul>
462			
463		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Many families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles.</li> <li>3. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy.</li> <li>4. Increased travel costs</li> </ul>
464		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in travel costs</li> <li>2. Fiskerton Road unsafe</li> <li>3. Any housing growth will increase congestion on Fiskerton Rd and in CW</li> <li>4. Against policy to reduce carbon emissions</li> <li>5. Increase in traffic in CW</li> </ul>
465		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsafe, particularly in winter</li> <li>2. Increase in journey times</li> <li>3. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB</li> </ul>
466		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased journey times and travel costs</li> <li>2. Concern over using LEB as faster road</li> </ul>
467		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are unsafe and more congested</li> </ul>
468		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased travel distance and thus travel costs. Increase in pollution</li> <li>2. Alternative routes unsuitable</li> <li>3. Increase in journey times</li> <li>4. Reduction in safety</li> <li>5. Additional housing will increase traffic and exacerbate issues</li> </ul>
469			<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased travel distance and thus travel costs. Increase in pollution</li> <li>2. Alternative routes unsuitable</li> <li>3. Increase in journey times</li> <li>4. Reduction in safety</li> <li>5. Additional housing will increase traffic and exacerbate issues</li> </ul>
470		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in journey times</li> <li>2. Alternative routes potentially unsafe</li> <li>3. Increase in traffic through CW</li> <li>4. A158 is already a red route</li> <li>5. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost.</li> <li>6. Increase in fuel costs</li> <li>7. Insufficient cost benefit analysis for local residents as a result of change</li> <li>8. Increase in pollution</li> <li>9. Against national sustainability policies which government funded scheme should adhere to</li> </ul>
471		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cost of road bridge can be funded by removal of NMU and LILO</li> <li>2. Alternative routes need to be reassessed for reasonableness test</li> <li>3. LCC have said Lack of provision not now down to economics</li> <li>4. Alternative routes less safe</li> <li>5. Increased travel costs</li> <li>6. Road bridge not significant cost</li> <li>7. Historic route</li> </ul>
472		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. This is a material change since previous PI.</li> <li>2. Increased travel distance on less safe roads</li> <li>3. Increased journey times and thus higher fuel costs</li> <li>4. Alternative routes less safe</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Safety of locals has been traded for wider safety benefits of LEB</li> <li>6. Impact of seasonal holiday traffic on A158 over longer period than peak. This leads to lack of robustness in traffic model. Journey times unreliable</li> <li>7. Traffic model has modelled local movements incorrectly and is not therefore robust</li> <li>8. Contrary to NPPF regarding low carbon future</li> <li>9. Increased pollution of at least 65 tonnes per year, possibly increasing to 100 tonnes per year.</li> <li>10. LILLO inappropriate for levels of traffic involved</li> <li>11. Changes to LILLO since PI have made junction more challenging</li> </ul>
473		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in response times for emergency services. CW Level crossing downtime will cause congestion and delay</li> <li>2. Increase in travel distance and journey time increases travel costs and pollution</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane exit will cause delay at Wragby Rd rbt.</li> <li>4. Wickes rbt already congested</li> <li>5. Insufficient consultation</li> <li>6. Cost of NMU and PI could have been spent on road bridge</li> </ul>
474		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should be dual c\way</li> <li>2. Lack of consultation and not listening</li> <li>3. Alternative routes not safe</li> <li>4. Wickes rbt congested already</li> <li>5. Traffic modelling questionable</li> <li>6. Road bridge could be funded by removing NMU and LILLO</li> <li>7. Severance of communities makes area less attractive to live in. Could lead to loss of school revenue</li> <li>8. Increase in emissions</li> <li>9. Local Plan aspirations compromised by alternative routes</li> </ul>
475		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes congested and less safe</li> <li>2. Additional housing will exacerbate issues</li> </ul>
476		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic on Kennel Lane</li> </ul>
477		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased journey time\distance</li> <li>2. Alternate routes inconvenient as congested and less safe</li> <li>3. LCC not aware of how many school children use HR</li> <li>4. Inadequate consultation</li> <li>5. Cost differential of road bridge reduced</li> <li>6. Majority of locals do not want NMU bridge</li> <li>7. Cost increased to accommodate horses</li> <li>8. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn difficult to use</li> <li>9. Seasonal traffic on A158 not modelled</li> <li>10. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>11. Increase in pollution of 65 tonnes per year. Could rise to 100 tonnes per year.</li> <li>12. Traffic modelling did not include proposed housing developments</li> <li>13. Historic route</li> <li>14. Intimidation of locals re loss of funding</li> </ul>
478		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cost adjustments could take place to include road bridge</li> <li>2. Increase in emissions and traffic time</li> <li>3. Severance of community</li> <li>4. Traffic implications including road safety and diversions when roads are closed temporarily</li> <li>5. Delete Heighington road bridge and use money at HR</li> <li>6. Impact on schools</li> <li>7. Additional costs to residents</li> <li>8. Disruption during construction</li> <li>9. Lack of consultation</li> </ul>
479		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kennel Lane unsafe</li> <li>2. Increased travel distance and thus travel costs</li> </ul>
480		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fiskerton Rd unsafe for cyclists, particularly in winter</li> <li>2. Will be forced to use car, resulting in increase in emissions and travel costs</li> </ul>
481		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are unsuitable</li> <li>2. 900 cars counted on Fiskerton Road between 7am and 9am</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn unsuitable</li> <li>4. Increased response times for emergency vehicles</li> </ul>
482		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change is at expense of community</li> <li>2. Should not cut corners for short term gain</li> </ul>
483		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No suitable alternative route</li> <li>2. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>3. Significant numbers of families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles.</li> </ul>
484		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic through CW</li> <li>2. Fiskerton Road less safe particularly in winter</li> <li>3. Wickes rbt congested</li> <li>4. Travel to Schools less safe</li> <li>5. Kennel Lane unsafe</li> <li>6. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn congested already</li> <li>7. Lack of access between HR and LEB down to cost cutting</li> </ul>
485		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes less safe</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Children in communities placed at higher risk</li> <li>3. Increase in travel distance and journey time.</li> <li>4. Increase in travel costs</li> <li>5. No economic reason to not construct road bridge</li> <li>6. Increased pollution</li> </ul>
486		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. lack of consultation</li> <li>2. alternative routes less safe</li> <li>3. Road bridge could be funded by removing NMU and LILO</li> <li>4. Unreasonable inconvenience</li> <li>5. Increased travel distance and thus increased travel costs</li> <li>6. Increase in CO2 emissions</li> <li>7. Over 350 children plus 20 staff travel to village schools daily. Additional CO2 emissions as a result</li> </ul>
487		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased traffic through CW</li> <li>2. Alternative routes unsafe, particularly in winter</li> <li>3. Wickes rbt already congested</li> <li>4. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn congested</li> <li>5. Increased response times for emergency services</li> <li>6. Current NMU plans unsafe</li> <li>7. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>8. Increased travel costs</li> <li>9. Increase in journey times</li> <li>10. Reduction in journey time reliability</li> <li>11. Increased travel time to hospital</li> </ul>
488		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in cost of agricultural business</li> <li>2. Cost of road bridge negligible relative to overall scheme cost</li> </ul>
489		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of consultation and publicity</li> <li>2. LCC admit road bridge will not now cost significantly more than current scheme</li> <li>3. Increased travel costs</li> <li>4. Alternative routes likely to be congested</li> <li>5. Alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>6. Increased traffic through CW</li> <li>7. Road bridge could be funded by removing NMU and LILO</li> <li>8. Traffic modelling out of date</li> <li>9. Additional development not taken into account in traffic modelling</li> </ul>
490		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>2. Kennel Lane\A158 junction congested and unsafe</li> <li>3. Significant numbers of trips to schools in villages from Carlton estate</li> <li>4. WLDC estimate 2000 more houses will be built on eastern side. This should be considered</li> <li>5. Waterford Lane will become rat run</li> </ul>
491		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NMU plans do not adequately consider safety of users</li> <li>2. Increased response time for emergency services</li> <li>3. No consideration of proposed housing growth</li> <li>4. Increased journey times and thus travel costs</li> </ul>
492		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NMU plans do not adequately consider safety of users</li> <li>2. Increased response time for emergency services</li> <li>3. Relatively small amount to construct a proper junction</li> <li>4. Should be dualled</li> <li>5. No consideration of proposed housing growth</li> <li>6. Increased journey times and thus travel costs</li> </ul>
493		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Kennel Lane less safe</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn less safe</li> <li>4. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>5. Increase in journey times and fuel costs for road users.</li> <li>6. 300+ families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> <li>7. housing growth along HR not considered in traffic modelling. HR should be part of development strategy. Concerns over capacity of LEB</li> </ul>
494		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Kennel Lane less safe</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn less safe</li> <li>4. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>5. Increase in journey times and fuel costs for road users.</li> <li>6. 300+ families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> <li>7. housing growth along HR not considered in traffic modelling. HR should be part of development strategy. Concerns over capacity of LEB</li> </ul>
495		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. needs to be dual carriageway</li> <li>2. alternative routes not as convenient and less safe</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn congested</li> <li>4. Increased response times for emergency services</li> <li>5. Increased travel distances and thus costs</li> <li>6. Increase in pollution which is against national policy</li> <li>7. Proposals for several thousand homes compromised by proposal</li> <li>8. Residents of Lincoln and adjoining areas disadvantaged</li> <li>9. Poor road network hindering potential</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
496		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines 2. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. 3. Loss of journey time reliability 4. Alternative routes less safe
497		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Lack of consultation 2. Cost differential between bridge options is now marginal
498		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increased traffic on Fiskerton Road 2. Greetwell Road less safe especially in winter
499		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Alternative routes less convenient 2. Alternative routes less safe
500		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Alternative routes less safe 2. Temporary closures of alternative routes will cause great inconvenience 3. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. 4. Cost differential between bridge options is now marginal
501		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increase in travel distance 2. Increase in traffic through CW 3. Increase in traffic puts schoolchildren's lives at risk
502		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increase in traffic through CW 2. Alternative routes unsuitable, exacerbated by increase in traffic 3. New housing and marina proposals will make matters worse 4. Wickes rbt congested 5. GR unsafe especially in winter 6. Will encourage rat running on Waterford Lane and Church Lane 7. Car parking on Kennel Lane will cause issues 8. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn congested
503		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Community severance is obscene 2. Cutting off safest quickest and most cost effective route 3. Alternative routes unsafe 4. Increased response times for emergency services 5. Note that Burton Road has a bridge with smaller community affected 6. Villages not taken into account when making decision
504		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Community severance is obscene 2. Cutting off safest quickest and most cost effective route 3. Alternative routes unsafe 4. Increased response times for emergency services 5. Note that Burton Road has a bridge with smaller community affected 6. Villages not taken into account when making decision
505		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Community severance is obscene 2. Cutting off safest quickest and most cost effective route 3. Increase in journey times 4. Alternative routes unsafe 5. Increased response times for emergency services 6. Note that Burton Road has a bridge with smaller community affected 7. Villages not taken into account when making decision
506		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Community severance is obscene 2. Cutting off safest quickest and most cost effective route 3. Alternative routes unsafe 4. Increased response times for emergency services 5. Note that Burton Road has a bridge with smaller community affected 6. Villages not taken into account when making decision
507		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Community severance is obscene 2. Cutting off safest quickest and most cost effective route 3. Increase in journey times 4. Alternative routes unsafe 5. Increased response times for emergency services 6. Note that Burton Road has a bridge with smaller community affected 7. Villages not taken into account when making decision 8. GR has high accident rate 9. Alternative routes already congested 10. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn unsafe
508		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines 2. Kennel Lane congested and unsafe. 3. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. 4. Increase in fuel costs for road users. 5. Increase in journey times 6. 300+ families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500+ cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced. Adverse environmental impact 7. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy.
509		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road 1. Increased travel distance 2. Alternative routes will become congested

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Increased travel costs</li> <li>4. Alternative routes less safe especially in bad weather</li> <li>5. Access to public transport limited</li> <li>6. Impact on environment, road safety and 'happiness and wellbeing'</li> <li>7. Proposed housing developments in the area.</li> <li>8. Large proportion of retired residents in villages, closure will isolate a vulnerable group</li> </ul>
510		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic through Fiskerton</li> <li>2. Wickes rbt congested</li> <li>3. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn congested</li> <li>4. Increase in traffic on alternative routes</li> <li>5. Increase in travel times</li> </ul>
511		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in fuel costs</li> <li>2. Increase in CO2 levels by 80 tonnes</li> <li>3. Against policy of reducing greenhouse gases</li> <li>4. Alternative routes often closed due to accidents, resulting in congestion</li> </ul>
512		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in fuel costs</li> <li>2. Increase in CO2 levels by 80 tonnes</li> <li>3. Against policy of reducing greenhouse gases</li> <li>4. Alternative routes often closed due to accidents, resulting in congestion</li> </ul>
513		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes less direct and less safe</li> <li>2. Increase in congestion on alternative routes</li> <li>3. Lack of publicity for change</li> </ul>
514		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes less safe, especially in bad weather. Exacerbated by increase in traffic</li> <li>2. Current and proposed growth will result in alternative routes becoming congested</li> <li>3. Cost of road bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILLO junction.</li> <li>4. VfM aspects of scheme not fully considered</li> </ul>
515		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in travel time and thus increased travel costs</li> <li>2. Alternative routes inadequate and less safe</li> <li>3. Accidents on alternative routes will lead to congestion</li> <li>4. Negative impact on the environment</li> <li>5. Loss of journey time reliability</li> <li>6. Increased response times for emergency services</li> </ul>
516		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kennel Lane unsuitable and less safe</li> <li>2. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn congested</li> <li>3. Increase in journey times and thus travel costs</li> </ul>
517		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes are less safe</li> <li>2. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn congested</li> <li>3. Increase in traffic through CW</li> </ul>
518		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic through CW</li> <li>2. Alternative routes unsuitable, exacerbated by increase in traffic</li> <li>3. New housing and marina proposals will make matters worse</li> <li>4. Wickes rbt congested</li> <li>5. GR unsafe especially in winter</li> <li>6. Will encourage rat running on Waterford Lane and Church Lane</li> <li>7. Car parking on Kennel Lane will cause issues</li> <li>8. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn congested</li> </ul>
519		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in fuel costs</li> <li>2. Increase in CO2 levels by 80 tonnes</li> <li>3. Against policy of reducing greenhouse gases</li> <li>4. Alternative routes often closed due to accidents, resulting in congestion</li> </ul>
520		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsuitable</li> <li>2. Increase in traffic through CW</li> <li>3. Additional development will exacerbate issues</li> </ul>
521		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All previous objections still valid</li> <li>2. Case for cost saving now flawed</li> <li>3. Uncertainty of general election outcome is now not an issue</li> <li>4. Increase in travel costs in times of austerity</li> <li>5. Incidents on alternative routes will cause congestion</li> <li>6. Traffic modelling has not taken into account future proposed development</li> <li>7. Alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>8. Could see reduction in school pupil numbers which may affect viability of school</li> <li>9. Significant evidence change needs further PI</li> <li>10. Against localism policy</li> </ul>
522		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would require parking spaces on HR adjacent to NMU bridge to continue final part of journey on foot.</li> <li>2. Additional development would exacerbate issues</li> <li>3. Potential loss of pupils could affect viability of CW school</li> <li>4. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn congested and would require rbt or signals which could be spent on HR road bridge</li> </ul>
523		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in travel distance</li> <li>2. Alternative routes unsuitable in winter</li> <li>3. Will encourage fly tipping and unsavoury activities</li> <li>4. Needs a roundabout on HR</li> </ul>
524		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsuitable</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Wickes jctn already congested, will increase with additional diverted traffic. Will also congest Outer Circle Road</li> <li>3. Increase in traffic through CW</li> <li>4. Loss of services provided by school</li> <li>5. Level crossing in CW would cause congestion due to extra traffic</li> <li>6. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn unsuitable</li> </ul>
525		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fiskerton Road unsuitable\unsafe and will get worse with extra traffic</li> </ul>
526		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased travel distances and thus travel costs</li> </ul>
527		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsuitable. Will be exacerbated by incident on either of them</li> <li>2. Increased response times for emergency vehicles</li> <li>3. Traffic from Additional housing proposals in CW will exacerbate issues.</li> <li>4. Increase in journey times will harm environment</li> <li>5. Cherry Willingham will become rat run</li> </ul>
528		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn congested and unsafe</li> <li>2. Queried whether sufficient traffic counts done on HR</li> <li>3. Lack of consultation</li> <li>4. All traffic will have to use Kennel Lane</li> <li>5. Accident risk to schoolchildren on and around Kennel Lane</li> <li>6. Against national policy of reducing carbon emissions</li> </ul>
529		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any incidents on alternative routes will cause congestion</li> <li>2. Increased traffic through CW</li> </ul>
530		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. lack of consultation</li> <li>2. alternative routes less safe</li> <li>3. Road bridge is good value for money and could be funded by removing NMU and LILO</li> <li>4. Unreasonable inconvenience</li> <li>5. Increased travel distance and thus increased travel costs</li> <li>6. Increase in CO2 emissions</li> <li>7. Over 350 children plus 20 staff travel to village schools daily. Additional CO2 emissions as a result</li> </ul>
531		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased travel distances and travel costs</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on alternative routes</li> <li>3. Fiskerton Road unsafe</li> </ul>
532		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines.</li> <li>2. Alternative routes unsafe. Crossing of LEB will be dangerous</li> <li>3. Cost of road bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILLO junction. Increase in fuel costs for road users.</li> <li>4. Loss of journey time reliability.</li> <li>5. 300+ families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> <li>6. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Concerns over capacity of LEB. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy.</li> <li>7. Longer journey means additional 438 miles per year.</li> <li>8. Will impact on business at Carlton centre</li> <li>9. May have to use breakfast club at school</li> <li>10. LCC position is based on estimates only. Reintroduction of road bridge should be part of tender process</li> <li>11. PI etc costs could have been spent on road bridge</li> </ul>
533		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. HR is not a shortcut it is a main road</li> <li>2. Increased travel distances</li> <li>3. Alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>4. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn congested</li> <li>5. Ludicrous unjust and unnecessary</li> </ul>
534		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased travel distance</li> <li>2. Could compromise school choice</li> <li>3. Alternative routes extremely dangerous</li> <li>4. Two public inquiries could have paid for road bridge</li> <li>5. HR\Bunkers Hill jctn unsafe</li> <li>6. Should be dualled</li> </ul>
535		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased travel times</li> <li>2. Elderly residents will find alternative routes more complicated</li> <li>3. Increased accident risk for schoolchildren</li> <li>4. Increased journey times and loss of reliability</li> </ul>
536		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic forced to use GR which is unsafe</li> <li>2. NMU at increased risk of accidents</li> <li>3. HR\Bunkers Hill jctn congested</li> <li>4. Kennel Lane unsafe</li> <li>5. Increased response times for emergency services</li> <li>6. Cost differential of road bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost.</li> <li>7. Increased travel distances and thus travel costs</li> <li>8. Increase in CO2 emissions which is against national and LCC policy</li> <li>9. Additional housing proposals will exacerbate issues</li> <li>10. Lack of consultation</li> </ul>
537		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic forced to use GR which is unsafe</li> <li>2. NMU at increased risk of accidents</li> <li>3. HR\Bunkers Hill jctn congested</li> <li>4. Kennel Lane unsafe</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Increased response times for emergency services</li> <li>6. Cost differential of road bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost.</li> <li>7. Increased travel distances and thus travel costs</li> <li>8. Increase in CO2 emissions which is against national and LCC policy</li> <li>9. Additional housing proposals will exacerbate issues</li> <li>10. Lack of consultation</li> </ul>
538		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Cost of road bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. Increase in fuel costs for road users. Loss of journey time reliability.</li> <li>3. 300+ families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> </ul>
539		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. Increase in fuel costs for road users. Loss of journey time reliability.</li> <li>3. 300+ families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> </ul>
540		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>2. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. Increase in fuel costs for road users. Loss of journey time reliability.</li> <li>3. 300+ families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> </ul>
541		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kennel Lane\A158 jctn unsafe</li> <li>2. Alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>3. Increase in travel costs and travel time</li> <li>4. Too remote from nearest bus service</li> <li>5. Will drive residents out of the villages</li> </ul>
542		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cost of Road Bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>2. Morally poor decision to increase carbon footprint.</li> <li>3. 300+ families use HR daily to take children to school. Also small businesses and commuters. 500 cars = 365,000 miles and thus additional 80 tonnes of CO2 produced.</li> <li>4. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>5. Loss of journey time reliability</li> <li>6. Increase in accident risk</li> <li>7. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy.</li> <li>8. Alternative routes more dangerous</li> </ul>
543		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cost of Road Bridge should be covered by contingencies in budget. Increase in costs will benefit more people. Additional saving by removing LILO junction.</li> <li>2. Increased travel distances and thus travels costs, on more congested routes.</li> <li>3. Traffic will increase on alternative routes, leading to increased journey times</li> <li>4. Alternative routes less safe</li> <li>5. Future developments will increase traffic</li> <li>6. Reduction in house value</li> <li>7. Safety of LILO</li> </ul>
544		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes less safe</li> <li>2. Road bridge could be funded by removing NMU and LILO</li> <li>3. Road bridge better value for money as used by more people</li> <li>4. Increase in CO2 emissions</li> <li>5. Over 350 children plus 20 staff travel to village schools daily. Additional CO2 emissions as a result</li> </ul>
545		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additional housing developments mean more roads needed not less</li> </ul>
546		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Severance will potentially impact on pupil numbers</li> <li>2. Severance will impact on useage of school facilities by general public</li> <li>3. Socio-economic impacts not fully considered in Environmental Statement</li> <li>4. Cost of road bridge is negligible relative to overall scheme cost. Additional saving by removing LILO junction. LILO is not a necessary provision</li> <li>5. Increased travel costs</li> <li>6. New rbts will be congested</li> <li>7. Increase of CO2 levels by 80 tonnes</li> <li>8. Insufficient distance between NMU crossing of HR and LEB. Speed of vehicles leaving LEB and visibility sight lines</li> <li>9. Traffic forecasting potentially wrong as doesn't include recent development in the area. LEB has insufficient capacity. Road bridge could be part of a development strategy.</li> <li>10. Increase in traffic through CW.</li> </ul>
547		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Permanent environmental impact</li> <li>2. £100 a year fuel costs and increased CO2 emissions</li> <li>3. Alternative routes are unsafe</li> <li>4. Additional development and growth will place traffic pressures on alternative routes</li> <li>5. Equestrian provision is unnecessary</li> <li>6. LCC have changed their position over potential loss of funding</li> <li>7. Loss of connection between Carlton estate residents and schools etc</li> </ul>
548		non	<p>Closure of Hawthorn Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposal is simply to cut costs</li> <li>2. Equestrian provision is unnecessary</li> <li>3. Increased travel time and travel costs</li> </ul>

Doc No	CPO	SRO	Objection
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Harm to the environment</li> <li>5. Increased response times for the emergency services</li> <li>6. Alternative routes less safe</li> </ul>
549		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative routes unsafe</li> <li>2. Loss of access to facilities</li> <li>3. Increase in travel costs and emissions</li> <li>4. Increase in traffic on Fiskerton Road</li> </ul>
550			
551			
552		non	Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Needs dualling and road bridge. Without these money is better spent elsewhere</li> </ul>
553	stat	stat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Would like to negotiate acquisition</li> <li>8. Object to permanent acquisition for temporary use</li> <li>9. Concerns over accommodation drainage</li> <li>10. Need to reconfirm undertakings from previous Inquiry regarding Plot 2\3A and access from Bloxholm Lane</li> </ul>
554	stat	stat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Needs resolution of concerns re Plot 2\3A</li> <li>2. Believe Plot 1\9A could be returned to landowner</li> <li>3. Need to justify land included in CPO and SRO</li> <li>4. Concern some land not given sufficient ecological value in SoR</li> <li>5. Would like to negotiate acquisition</li> <li>6. NMU route A not long enough on SRO Plan 2</li> <li>7. Need confirmation accommodation works are as agreed previously</li> </ul>
555	stat	stat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requires adequate safeguards for their plant</li> <li>2. Requires rights to protect, maintain and access plant</li> </ul>
556	non		Closure of Hawthorn Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Money for LEB should be elsewhere</li> </ul>

### SUPPORTERS

Doc No		Support
1		Support SRO and NMU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inconveniences need to be balanced with the needs, safety and wellbeing of others.</li> <li>2. Additional expense of another public inquiry cannot be justified.</li> <li>3. Fully consulted. No one can claim after this length of time they have not had sufficient consultation.</li> <li>4. Blocking off road will increase safety for play area located near proposed junction. Increase safety of Road and stop rat running.</li> <li>5. Reduction of traffic of traffic along Hawthorn Road will have beneficial effects elsewhere.</li> <li>6. Blocking off will stop an increase of traffic along that route.</li> <li>7. Loss of opportunity if not constructed.</li> </ul>
2		Support SRO and NMU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Blocking off Hawthorn Road will ensure a safer road.</li> <li>2. Will stop speeding drivers who disobey the current 30mph speed limit.</li> <li>3. Will stop road being used as a rat run.</li> <li>4. Reduction of traffic of traffic along Hawthorn Road will have beneficial effects elsewhere.</li> <li>5. Blocking off will stop an increase of traffic along that route</li> <li>6. Blocking off road will increase safety for play area located near proposed junction.</li> <li>7. Fully consulted. No one can claim after this length of time they have not had sufficient consultation.</li> <li>8. Loss of opportunity if not constructed.</li> <li>9. Inconveniences need to be balanced with the needs, safety and wellbeing of others.</li> </ul>
3		Support SRO and NMU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will stop speeding drivers who disobey the current 30mph speed limit.</li> <li>2. Lessen the increase of traffic down Hawthorn Road.</li> <li>3. Stopping off option is best option.</li> <li>4. Will stop road being used as a rat run.</li> <li>5. NMU Bridge now suits Inspectors requirements.</li> <li>6. Further inquiry a waste of public money.</li> <li>7. Much needed infrastructure.</li> </ul>
4		Supports NMU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do not want another enquiry delaying things further. Bypass long overdue</li> <li>2. Believe NMU is the best option.</li> <li>3. Hawthorn Road already gets backed up and would become more apparent if Road Bridge is installed.</li> <li>4. Will stop speeding drivers</li> <li>5. Will stop road being used as a rat run</li> </ul>
5		Support SRO and Bypass <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hawthorn road very dangerous for resident s due to speeding drivers.</li> <li>2. Relief that the road would be stopped up.</li> <li>3. Residents experience many problems from be able to cross the road.</li> </ul>
6		Support SRO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Blocking off of Hawthorn Road is essential to reduce traffic for safety of pedestrians and residents.</li> <li>2. Road has become a rat run.</li> <li>3. Sheer quantity of traffic is dangerous for this type of road.</li> <li>4. Calming measures didn't work.</li> <li>5. Road Bridge shouldn't be considered.</li> <li>6. Traffic will increase when future housing is built and further increase above points.</li> </ul>
7		Support SRO and NMU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic will increase when future housing is built</li> <li>2. Road Bridge will nullify use of bypass.</li> <li>3. Hawthorn Road is not designed to take on board this level of traffic or any further increase</li> <li>4. Proposed bypass will adequately cater for Hawthorn Road not having a Road Bridge.</li> </ul>
8		Support SRO and NMU

Doc No	Support
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stopping up of Hawthorn Road is welcomed to make area safer and living environment quieter.</li> <li>2. Road used as a Rat run</li> <li>3. Traffic will increase when future housing is built and further increase issues.</li> <li>4. Fully consulted. No one can claim after this length of time they have not had sufficient consultation.</li> <li>5. City of Lincoln and surrounding areas would greatly benefit from the bypass scheme.</li> <li>6. The provision of LILO junction and safe alternative routes will ensure convenient routes for people travelling by motor vehicle.</li> </ol>
9	<p>Support SRO and NMU</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Money is not available for a road bridge or to dual the carriageway.</li> <li>2. LCC will incur further unnecessary costs resubmitting plans or having further consultations</li> <li>3. Delay will mean money available now will be lost and several more years before further funding will be secured.</li> <li>4. Implementation of scheme is already behind the planned timescale.</li> <li>5. Meanwhile congestion increases on other routes</li> <li>6. Will stop speeding drivers who disobey the current 30mph speed limit.</li> <li>7. Joining Hawthorn Road or bunkers Hill at peak times is frustrating enough.</li> <li>8. Congestion creates pollution noise and delays</li> <li>9. Purpose of plan is to improve transport system in the City, building a Road Bridge at Hawthorn road will not contribute to that.</li> </ol>
10	<p>Support for NMU and SRO</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inconveniences need to be balanced with the needs, safety and wellbeing of others.</li> <li>2. Additional expense of another public inquiry cannot be justified.</li> <li>3. Fully consulted. No one can claim after this length of time they have not had sufficient consultation.</li> <li>4. Blocking off road will increase safety for play area located near proposed junction. Increase safety of Road and stop rat running.</li> <li>5. Reduction of traffic of traffic along Hawthorn Road will have beneficial effects elsewhere.</li> <li>6. Blocking off will stop an increase of traffic along that route.</li> <li>7. Loss of opportunity if not constructed</li> </ol>
11	<p>Support for NMU and SRO</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inconveniences need to be balanced with the needs, safety and wellbeing of others.</li> <li>2. Additional expense of another public inquiry cannot be justified.</li> <li>3. Fully consulted. No one can claim after this length of time they have not had sufficient consultation.</li> <li>4. Blocking off road will increase safety for play area located near proposed junction. Increase safety of Road and stop rat running.</li> <li>5. Reduction of traffic of traffic along Hawthorn Road will have beneficial effects elsewhere.</li> <li>6. Blocking off will stop an increase of traffic along that route.</li> <li>7. Loss of opportunity if not constructed</li> </ol>
12	<p>Support for NMU and SRO</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fully support revised plans.</li> <li>2. Be dual by all means if money available but no need to change bridge scheme.</li> <li>3. Current proposals will relive traffic congestion and improve safety in residential areas.</li> <li>4. No need to have another enquiry to re-examine the same questions as before.</li> <li>5. Traffic will increase when future housing is built and further increase issues.</li> <li>6. Greetwell Quarry Residents Association gave unanimous support for current NMU Bridge.</li> </ol>
13	<p>Support for Bypass Scheme</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local businesses should get a boost when bypass is completed</li> <li>2. Bypass will help maximise business growth.</li> <li>3. Bypass will reduce Co2 emissions because of reduction of congestion in the City.</li> <li>4. Bypass needs to be built asap to ensure businesses select Lincoln for growth and investment.</li> <li>5. Bypass will result in growth for our business.</li> </ol>
14	<p>Support for Bypass Scheme</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LEB is a number infrastructure priority for City and the long term benefit of the scheme cannot be underestimated.</li> <li>2. Delays would impact on progress of further schemes.</li> <li>3. The minor inconvenience by the absence of a direct vehicular connection from Hawthorn road to the Bypass is fully justified with regard to significant costs savings.</li> <li>4. Full junction would provide an unwanted interruption to North South traffic flows.</li> <li>5. Further increase rat running.</li> <li>6. Welcome the proposal for a footpath/cycleway bridge across the bypass.</li> <li>7. Overall the Bypass scheme will improve accessibility for Cherry Willingham.</li> </ol>
15	<p>Support to Bypass Scheme</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LEB is a number infrastructure priority for City and the long term benefit of the scheme cannot be underestimated.</li> <li>2. Delays would impact on progress of further schemes.</li> <li>3. The minor inconvenience by the absence of a direct vehicular connection from Hawthorn road to the Bypass is fully justified with regard to significant costs savings.</li> <li>4. Full junction would provide an unwanted interruption to North South traffic flows.</li> <li>5. Further increase rat running.</li> <li>6. Welcome the proposal for a footpath/cycleway bridge across the bypass.</li> <li>7. Overall the Bypass scheme will improve accessibility for Cherry Willingham.</li> </ol>
16	<p>Support for NMU and SRO</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stopping up of Hawthorn welcomed as this will make the roads safer and living environment quieter</li> <li>2. Road used as a Rat run</li> <li>3. Traffic will increase when future housing is built and further increase issues.</li> <li>4. Fully consulted. No one can claim after this length of time they have not had sufficient consultation.</li> <li>5. City of Lincoln and surrounding areas would greatly benefit from the bypass scheme.</li> <li>6. The provision of LILO junction and safe alternative routes will ensure convenient routes for people travelling by motor vehicle.</li> </ol>
17	<p>Support for NMU and SRO</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the stopping up of Hawthorn Road.</li> <li>2. Congestion at Hawthorn Rd/Bunkers Hill is a major problem.</li> <li>3. Speeding along this portion of Road is rife.</li> <li>4. Eastern bypass is urgently needed and review of plans will lead to more delays.</li> </ol>
18	<p>Support for Bypass Scheme and SRO</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bypass will resolve some of the traffic problems within Lincoln caused by the commute and heavy commercial traffic.</li> <li>2. Cutting through Hawthorn Rd is a small price to pay for the overall gains.</li> <li>3. Tragedy if whole scheme is lost over the single issue of Hawthorn Rd, when there are so many other benefits for the City to gain.</li> </ol>

Doc No		Support
19		Support for NMU and Bypass Scheme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LEB is a number infrastructure priority for City and the long term benefit of the scheme cannot be underestimated.</li> <li>2. Delays would impact on business and investor confidence</li> <li>3. The minor inconvenience by the absence of a direct vehicular connection from Hawthorn road to the Bypass is fully justified with regard to significant costs savings.</li> <li>4. Full junction would provide an unwanted interruption to North South traffic flows.</li> <li>5. Further increase rat running.</li> <li>6. Welcome the proposal for a footpath/cycleway bridge across the bypass.</li> <li>7. Overall the Bypass scheme will improve accessibility for Cherry Willingham</li> </ul>
20		Support for Bypass Scheme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bypass will bring economic benefits which a hugely significant.</li> <li>2. Road should be built quickly to strengthen and maintain confidence in our growing economy.</li> <li>3. Had confidence to invest in own business on the basis the LEB was to be finally brought to fruition</li> <li>4. Any delays will extremely damaging to general investor confidence and could prove catastrophic to business.</li> </ul>
21		Support for Bypass scheme and SRO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The building of the Bypass is long overdue and don't want to see further delays..</li> <li>2. Blocking off Hawthorn Rd can only reduce amount of traffic along that route. Small price to pay for peace of mind that a safer Hawthorn Road would bring.</li> <li>3. Will stop speeding drivers who disobey the current 30mph speed limit.</li> </ul>
22		Support for Bypass Scheme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Eastern Bypass is very important for the future prosperity of the City of Lincoln.</li> <li>2. Objectors have grossly over estimated the value of the Hawthorn Rd route as during rush hour there is a line of stationary traffic often extending back as far as the proposed junction.</li> <li>3. Villagers will have access to various parts of the city without little delay via the bypass.</li> <li>4. Major accidents have happened along Hawthorn Rd causing destruction of property and lucky no one was killed or seriously injured. Do not agree Hawthorn Rd is safer than alternative routes.</li> <li>5. Road would be continually used as a Rat run</li> <li>6. Concerned over risks over further delay to bypass scheme</li> </ul>
23		Support SRO and bypass <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Serious congestion at Hawthorn Rd/Bunkers Hill junction. Impedes on driveway access</li> <li>2. Many drivers not obeying speed limit of road.</li> <li>3. Road is used as a rat run</li> <li>4. Bypass is needed to relieve amount of traffic going through to city centre</li> <li>5. Stopping up of Hawthorn Road will promote a safer environment to live in.</li> </ul>
24	NOT USED	
25		Support SRO and NMU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stopping up of Hawthorn Road will promote a safer environment to live in</li> <li>2. Many drivers not obeying speed limit of road. Previous calming measures have not worked</li> <li>3. Road is used as a rat run</li> <li>4. Serious congestion at Hawthorn Rd/Bunkers Hill junction.</li> <li>5. Current proposals present best option to tackle issues</li> <li>6. Blocking off of road will make neighbouring play area far safer</li> <li>7. Imperative that Bypass goes ahead as this will improve the lives of the vast majority of residents within City of Lincoln and surrounding areas.</li> </ul>
26		Support Bypass and NMU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LEB is a number infrastructure priority for City and the long term benefit of the scheme cannot be underestimated.</li> <li>2. Delays would impact on business and investor confidence</li> <li>3. The minor inconvenience by the absence of a direct vehicular connection from Hawthorn road to the Bypass is fully justified with regard to significant costs savings.</li> <li>4. Full junction would provide an unwanted interruption to North South traffic flows.</li> <li>5. Further increase rat running.</li> <li>6. Welcome the proposal for a footpath/cycleway bridge across the bypass.</li> <li>7. Overall the Bypass scheme will improve accessibility for Cherry Willingham</li> </ul>
27		Support for current proposals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Wants works on bypass to commence as soon as possible.</li> <li>2. Help strengthen and maintain confidence in our local economy</li> </ul>
28		Support for bypass and current proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LEB is a number infrastructure priority for City and the long term benefit of the scheme cannot be underestimated.</li> <li>2. Delays would impact on business and investor confidence</li> <li>3. The minor inconvenience by the absence of a direct vehicular connection from Hawthorn road to the Bypass is fully justified with regard to significant costs savings.</li> <li>4. Full junction would provide an unwanted interruption to North South traffic flows.</li> <li>5. Further increase rat running.</li> <li>6. Welcome the proposal for a footpath/cycleway bridge across the bypass.</li> <li>7. Overall the Bypass scheme will improve accessibility for Cherry Willingham</li> </ul>
29		Support for SRO and NMU. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Blocking off Hawthorn Road will ensure a safer road.</li> <li>2. Will stop speeding drivers who disobey the current 30mph speed limit.</li> <li>3. Will stop road being used as a rat run.</li> <li>4. Reduction of traffic of traffic along Hawthorn Road will have beneficial effects elsewhere.</li> <li>5. Blocking off will stop an increase of traffic along that route</li> <li>6. Blocking off road will increase safety for play area located near proposed junction.</li> <li>7. Fully consulted. No one can claim after this length of time they have not had sufficient consultation.</li> <li>8. Loss of opportunity if not constructed.</li> <li>9. Inconveniences need to be balanced with the needs, safety and wellbeing of others.</li> </ul>
30		Support for SRO and NMU. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Blocking off Hawthorn Road will ensure a safer road.</li> <li>2. Will stop speeding drivers who disobey the current 30mph speed limit.</li> <li>3. Will stop road being used as a rat run.</li> <li>4. Reduction of traffic of traffic along Hawthorn Road will have beneficial effects elsewhere.</li> <li>5. Blocking off will stop an increase of traffic along that route</li> <li>6. Blocking off road will increase safety for play area located near proposed junction.</li> <li>7. Fully consulted. No one can claim after this length of time they have not had sufficient consultation.</li> <li>8. Loss of opportunity if not constructed.</li> </ul>

Doc No	Support
	9. Inconveniences need to be balanced with the needs, safety and wellbeing of others.
31	Support Scheme 1. Properly consulted 2. NMU supported by most residents who suffer from air pollution and have decreased life expectancy 3. Reduce rat running
32	Support SRO 1. Alleviate congestion 2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion 3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs 4. Sufficient consultation 5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln 6. Reduce speeding 7. Educe rat running 8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic 9. Less congested and safer junctions 10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents
33	Support scheme 1. Bypass is critical supporting infrastructure 2. Necessary to improve access and movement around city for existing and future residents. 3. Agreed priority for CIL 4. Underpins growth strategy for Central Lincolnshire fundamentally important for sustainable and prosperous future
34	Support Scheme 4. Properly consulted 5. NMU supported by most residents who suffer from air pollution and have decreased life expectancy 6. Reduce rat running
35	Support stopping up of Hawthorn Road 1. Vehicles speed along Hawthorn Road 2. Hawthorn Road will have less traffic flow, be safer and quieter 3. Reduce use of Carlton Estate as a rat run 4. Hawthorn Road/A158 junction quieter and safer 5. Road bridge would make location of play park dangerous and noisy
36	Support SRO 1. Alleviate congestion 2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion 3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs 4. Sufficient consultation 5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln 6. Reduce speeding 7. Educe rat running 8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic 9. Less congested and safer junctions 10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents
37	Support SRO 1. Alleviate congestion 2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion 3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs 4. Sufficient consultation 5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln 6. Reduce speeding 7. Educe rat running 8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic 9. Less congested and safer junctions 10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents
38	Support SRO 1. Alleviate congestion 2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion 3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs 4. Sufficient consultation 5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln 6. Reduce speeding 7. Educe rat running 8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic 9. Less congested and safer junctions 10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents
39	Support SRO 1. Alleviate congestion 2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion 3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs 4. Sufficient consultation 5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln 6. Reduce speeding 7. Educe rat running 8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic 9. Less congested and safer junctions 10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents
40	Support SRO 1. Alleviate congestion 2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion 3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs 4. Sufficient consultation 5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln 6. Reduce speeding 7. Educe rat running 8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic 9. Less congested and safer junctions 10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents

Doc No		Support
41		Support SRO <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alleviate congestion</li> <li>2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion</li> <li>3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs</li> <li>4. Sufficient consultation</li> <li>5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln</li> <li>6. Reduce speeding</li> <li>7. Educe rat running</li> <li>8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic</li> <li>9. Less congested and safer junctions</li> <li>10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents</li> </ol>
42		Support SRO <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alleviate congestion</li> <li>2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion</li> <li>3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs</li> <li>4. Sufficient consultation</li> <li>5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln</li> <li>6. Reduce speeding</li> <li>7. Educe rat running</li> <li>8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic</li> <li>9. Less congested and safer junctions</li> <li>10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents</li> </ol>
43		Support SRO <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alleviate congestion</li> <li>2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion</li> <li>3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs</li> <li>4. Sufficient consultation</li> <li>5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln</li> <li>6. Reduce speeding</li> <li>7. Educe rat running</li> <li>8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic</li> <li>9. Less congested and safer junctions</li> <li>10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents</li> </ol>
44		Support SRO <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alleviate congestion</li> <li>2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion</li> <li>3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs</li> <li>4. Sufficient consultation</li> <li>5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln</li> <li>6. Reduce speeding</li> <li>7. Educe rat running</li> <li>8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic</li> <li>9. Less congested and safer junctions</li> <li>10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents</li> </ol>
45		Support SRO <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alleviate congestion</li> <li>2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion</li> <li>3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs</li> <li>4. Sufficient consultation</li> <li>5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln</li> <li>6. Reduce speeding</li> <li>7. Educe rat running</li> <li>8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic</li> <li>9. Less congested and safer junctions</li> <li>10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents</li> </ol>
46		Support SRO <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alleviate congestion</li> <li>2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion</li> <li>3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs</li> <li>4. Sufficient consultation</li> <li>5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln</li> <li>6. Reduce speeding</li> <li>7. Educe rat running</li> <li>8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic</li> <li>9. Less congested and safer junctions</li> <li>10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents</li> </ol>
47		Support SRO <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alleviate congestion</li> <li>2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion</li> <li>3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs</li> <li>4. Sufficient consultation</li> <li>5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln</li> <li>6. Reduce speeding</li> <li>7. Educe rat running</li> <li>8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic</li> <li>9. Less congested and safer junctions</li> <li>10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents</li> </ol>
48		Support SRO <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alleviate congestion</li> <li>2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion</li> <li>3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs</li> <li>4. Sufficient consultation</li> <li>5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln</li> <li>6. Reduce speeding</li> <li>7. Educe rat running</li> <li>8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic</li> <li>9. Less congested and safer junctions</li> <li>10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents</li> </ol>

Doc No		Support
49		Support SRO 1. Alleviate congestion 2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion 3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs 4. Sufficient consultation 5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln 6. Reduce speeding 7. Educe rat running 8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic 9. Less congested and safer junctions 10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents
50		Support SRO 1. Alleviate congestion 2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion 3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs 4. Sufficient consultation 5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln 6. Reduce speeding 7. Educe rat running 8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic 9. Less congested and safer junctions 10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents
51		Support SRO 1. Alleviate congestion 2. Benefit to Lincoln from construction of bypass delays will cause greater congestion 3. Safety, environmental impact and residents needs 4. Sufficient consultation 5. Roads in neighbourhood safer and living environment quieter. Hawthorn Road not an arterial route into Lincoln 6. Reduce speeding 7. Educe rat running 8. Maintain a sensible level of traffic 9. Less congested and safer junctions 10. Ensure a safe neighbourhood playground and safety and wellbeing of local residents
52		1. Overall scheme provides traffic relief and infrastructure facility into the city and surrounding areas. 2. Current arrangements maintain strength and economy of Lincoln
53		1. Eastern Bypass should be completed as soon as possible.
54		1. Support for Eastern Bypass and current design 2. Delays to project will have a detrimental impact on economic viability an vitality of Lincoln and surrounding catchment.
55		1. Approval for Eastern Bypass in current form. 2. Delays will affect the growing economy and damage potential investment streams.
56		Support Bypass as proposals as drafted. 1. Number 1 infrastructure priority in Lincolnshire. Long term economic benefits. 2. Delays will impact on business and investor confidence. 3. Inconvenience caused by absence of direct access from Hawthorn Road justified having regards to the costs savings and massive benefits of scheme as a whole. 4. Full junction interrupt north south traffic flows and increase noise nuisance and encourage rat running. 5. Footpath/cycleway provide safe access. 6. Left turn into Hawthorn Road for traffic from north will improve access and left turn will provide reasonable route via Greetwell Road.
57	NON OBJECTION	
58		1. Support proposals for NMU. 2. Carlton Estate seen increase in non residential traffic over last 8 years. 3. Road beyond capacity designed to deal with and fear for safety of other road users based on excessive volume and speed of traffic. 4. Stopping up of Hawthorn Road prevent rat running and allows enjoyment of estate. 5. Reducing traffic speed and flow via current approved proposals essential to maintain safety 6. Housing development will mean increased traffic on road.
59		1. Road bridge increase traffic through Carlton Estate and make it a rat run. 2. Access to Carlton Academy unsafe. 3. Crossing Hawthorn Road to access play part is problematic due to traffic at peak times.
60		1. Infrastructure essential to confidence in Lincolnshire economy. 2. Full junction at Hawthorn Road provide unwanted interruption to north south traffic flows 3. Delays to scheme knock on impact for LCC to progress other schemes 4. Significant costs implication of a full junction 5. Supports footpath/cycleway bridge
61		1. Support proposal to close Hawthorn road. 2. Carlton Boulevard being adversely compromised by too much traffic.