



**Guildhall Gainsborough
Lincolnshire DN21 2NA
Tel: 01427 676676 Fax: 01427 675170**

This meeting will be recorded and published on the website

AGENDA

**Planning Committee
Wednesday 24 July 2013 at 6.30 pm
The Council Chamber, Guildhall, Gainsborough**

Members: Councillor Chris Underwood-Frost (Chairman)
Councillor Stuart Curtis (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors Owen Bierley, Alan Caine, David Cotton, Richard Doran,
Ian Fleetwood, Malcolm Leaning, Giles McNeill, Jessie Milne, Roger
Patterson, Judy Rainsforth

1. Apologies for absence.
2. Public Participation Period. Up to 15 minutes are allowed for public participation. Participants are restricted to 3 minutes each.
3. Minutes.
Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 26 June 2013, previously circulated.
4. Members' Declarations of Interest.

Members may make any declarations of interest at this point but may also make them at any time during the course of the meeting.
5. Update on Government/Local Changes in Planning Policy

Agendas, Reports and Minutes will be provided upon request in the following formats:

Large Clear Print: Braille: Audio Tape: Native Language

6. Planning Applications for Determination
(Summary attached at Appendix A)
Print herewith PL.04 13/14

PAPER A

7. To note the following determination of appeals:

- i) Appeal by Mr R VanCamp against West Lindsey District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for a single and a two storey extension to the front of the property. Alterations to the existing garage and new single garage to front of property at 21 Saxilby Road, Sturton by Stow.

Appeal Dismissed See copy letter attached as Appendix Bi

Officer's original recommendation to refuse permission.

- ii) Appeal by Mr Patrick Britton against West Lindsey District Council's refusal to grant planning permission for the installation of a 4 kilowatt array of ground mounted solar panels, in an orchard within the grounds of Kingthorpe Manor Farm, Kingthorpe.

Appeal Dismissed See copy letter attached as Appendix Bii

Officer's original recommendation to refuse permission.

- iii) Appeal by Mr J McHale against West Lindsey District Council's refusal to grant planning permission to demolish north elevation and rebuild as a two extension to match existing at Holton Manor, Lincoln Road, Holton-cum-Beckering

Appeal Dismissed See copy letter attached as Appendix Biii

Officer's original recommendation to refuse permission.

M Gill
Chief Executive
The Guildhall
Gainsborough
16 July 2013

1 - 129426 – Cherry Willingham

Planning application for change of use of gamesroom to provide child care facilities at 64 Croft Lane, Cherry Willingham

RECOMMENDED DECISION: Grant Permission

2 – 129581 - Blyton

Planning application for proposed residential development of 1no. pair of semi detached dwellings, 1no. detached dwelling and detached garages - resubmission of 128808 – on land R/O 30 Laughton Road, Blyton

RECOMMENDED DECISION: Grant with conditions subject to the signing of a unilateral undertaking securing a contribution towards affordable housing in the District

3 - 128607 - Grayingham

Planning application to instal 2no. 50kw wind turbines and ancillary works - 35m height to tip of blade at Grayingham Grange, Grange Lane, Grayingham

RECOMMENDED DECISION: That had the decision to determine the application still rested with this Council, permission be refused on the grounds of unacceptable interference to air traffic control radar at RAF Waddington, and as such would conflict with guidance contained within circular 1/03 Aerodrome safeguarding.

4 – 128961 – Bardney

Planning application for change of use of pub to 2no.dwellings and erect 5no. new dwellings on car park at The Bards, 2 Wragby Road, Bardney.

RECOMMENDED DECISION: That the decision to grant planning permission subject to conditions be delegated to the Director of Regeneration and Planning upon the receipt of an acceptable unilateral undertaking under s106 of the amended Town & Country Planning Act 1990 obligating a payment of £20,000 to be paid to West Lindsey District Council for the provision of affordable housing within the district.

5 – 129990 and 130027 – Blyton

Planning application to remove condition 5 of planning permission 129624 granted 20 March 2013, regarding occupancy and

Planning application to remove condition 4 of planning permission 99P0794 granted 19 September 2001, regarding occupancy on Land at Grace Park Laughton Road Blyton

RECOMMENDED DECISION: Grant with conditions

6 – 130004 – Gainsborough

Planning Application for first floor extension over single storey section of dwelling- resubmission of 129712 at 11 Nelson Street Gainsborough Lincolnshire DN21 2SE

RECOMMENDED DECISION: Refuse planning permission



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2013

by H R Stephens BA MPhil DipTP MRTPI FRSA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 June 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/13/2198279

21 Saxilby Road, Sturton by Stow, Lincoln LN1 2AA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R VanCamp against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 129606 was refused by notice dated 26 March 2013.
 - The development proposed is a single and a two storey extension to the front of the property. Alterations to the existing garage and new single garage to front of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey detached dwelling located in a residential area of Sturton by Stow. The dwelling is set back from the highway and forms part of a row of three similar detached dwellings. There is a front driveway leading to an attached double garage. The front garden is reasonable in size with a larger rear garden.
4. The appeal proposal seeks permission for a single and two storey extension to the front of the property, alterations to the existing garage and a new single garage to the front of the property.
5. I am aware of the planning history of the site which is set out in the Council's report. I note that planning permission was granted for a proposed single and two storey extension to the front of the property with alterations to the existing garage on 2 January 2013.
6. The development plan for the area includes the adopted West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006. Relevant policies in this case are Policy STRAT1 and RES11. Policy STRAT1 is a keynote policy against which all development proposals are assessed. Policy RES11 seeks to ensure that any extensions to dwellings are in keeping with the style, character and appearance of the existing property and do not have a negative impact on the living conditions of any neighbouring occupiers. Planning permission will be granted to extend a dwelling in a settlement provided that the proposal meets the criteria set out in the Policy RES11.

7. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012. The NPPF largely carries forward existing planning policies and protections in a significantly more streamlined and accessible form. It also introduces the presumption in favour of sustainable development¹ and makes adjustments to some specific policies. The NPPF states that a 'core planning principle' is that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.² Section 6 of the NPPF Requiring Good Design indicates that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. I have taken the NPPF into account as a material consideration in this case.
8. I accept that the proposal would not introduce a terracing effect in the street scene. I also accept that the materials would match the existing dwelling and the roofs would retain existing pitched gable and roof styles. The extension and single garage would be subordinate in height as they are set down from the existing roof height and subordinate in volume due to the size of the extension in relation to the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the front garden area is well screened at all boundaries by high hedging. The proposal would not cause any further overlooking, have an overbearing impact or cause any loss of light to the neighbouring dwellings due to its position, size and the existing boundary screening.
9. However, as I saw on my site visit, despite the existing boundary screening to the front, the proposed garage would still be visible from the highway when travelling along Saxilby Road, particularly from the south. The street scene along Saxilby Road is characterised by open front garden areas with garages to the side or rear and not in the front garden area. Whilst I accept there are some garages on Saxilby Road set further forward than the appeal proposal these are dissimilar in that they have gables facing the highway. The proposed garage on the appeal site would not respect the existing pattern of development in the immediate vicinity. It would be an incongruous and alien feature in the street scene. I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the aforementioned development plan policies and national advice in the NPPF. On the main issue the appeal must fail.

Other Matters

10. I have taken into account all other matters raised. I accept that the proposal would not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling. No significant trees or other landscaping features would be affected by the proposal and an adequate amount of off street parking would remain. An adequate amount of private garden space would also remain to the front and rear gardens. The garages fronting Tillbridge Lane did not persuade me that the appeal proposal would be appropriate in this situation. Planning conditions would not overcome the objections which I have described. None of these matters changes my overall conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

Harold Stephens

INSPECTOR

¹ Paragraph 14

² Paragraph 17



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2013

by **J A B Gresty MA MRICS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 June 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/13/2197150

Kingthorpe Manor Farm, Kingthorpe, Market Rasen, Lincolnshire LN8 5JF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Patrick Britton against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 128966, dated 10 December 2012, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2013.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a 4 kilowatt array of ground mounted solar panels, in an orchard within the grounds of Kingthorpe Manor Farm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a ground mounted array of two rows of solar panels which has been erected in a grass paddock to the north-west of Kingthorpe Manor Farm house, a substantial brick built, grade II listed building dating from the late 18th century. There are other listed buildings a little further to the south, including Kingthorpe House, which combine with Kingthorpe Manor Farm to create an attractive group of tradition buildings which form the heart of the small hamlet of Kingthorpe.
4. The array is just over 9 metres long and, with a maximum height of about 2.4 metres, the structure is significantly larger and taller than any of the hen coops and other huts I saw nearby in the paddock. Although the base and sides of the installation are partly enclosed by rough sawn timber panelling, the panels have a prominent, stark and shiny appearance when viewed from the south.
5. There is relatively young, densely planted copse of mixed deciduous trees and shrubs immediately behind the structure. This acts as a backdrop to the array when viewed from a southerly direction. Whilst this helps to soften its appearance in the wider landscape, the array is very prominent when viewed from by Kingthorpe Manor Farm house.
6. In summer, the copse and the hedging around the paddock hide the structure from view from the main road. However, in spite of the density of the planting,

it is reasonable to assume that the structure would be visible from the road in winter. Similarly, in summer the back and east sides of the structure are partly hidden from view from the lane to the east by vegetation but would be in open to public view in winter. Whilst the back of the structure does not have the shiny appearance of the front panels, the metal framework has a utilitarian appearance and the reflective cap along the top of the panels stands out prominently when viewed from the side and back.

7. Paragraph vii. of Policy STRAT 1 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006 (LP) requires all development to take full account of the need to protect the environment with specific regard to the character, appearance and setting of listed buildings. Also, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) recognises the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. In this case the array stands out in the local landscape as a stark and utilitarian feature which is at odds with the character and appearance of the nearby listed buildings, contrary to the general thrust of LP Policy STRAT 1 and the Framework.
8. Kingthorpe is a small hamlet in a rural location and is surrounded by gently rolling farmland. LP Paragraph A96 states that the countryside should be conserved for the sake of its own beauty and LP Policy STRAT 12 indicates that planning permission for development in rural locations will not be granted unless the development necessitates a countryside location, such as for agriculture, or the development meets an objective supported by other LP policies. In this case the development is not prominent in the wider landscape and does not detract from the character or appearance of the countryside in this respect. Whilst the array is not directly linked to a rural location by necessity, with regard to generation of renewable energy it meets the aims of sustainable development sought by the Framework. Therefore, on balance I conclude that the development is in keeping with the general thrust of LP Policy STRAT 12.

Conclusions

9. At the heart of the Framework, there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. In this case the stark appearance of the structure in the local landscape, which is emphasised by the height of the two rows of panels, result in it detracting from the setting of the nearby listed house and, consequently, from the overall character and appearance of the locality. Therefore, on balance, I conclude that the array does not represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework and, for the above reasons, that the appeal should be dismissed.

J A B Gresty

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2013

by **J A B Gresty MA MRICS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 June 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/13/2197860

**Holton Manor, Lincoln Road, Holton-cum-Beckering, Market Rasen
LN8 5NG**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J McHale against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 129347 was refused by notice dated 20 March 2013.
 - The development proposed is to demolish north elevation and rebuild as a two extension to match existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a substantial, detached, two-storey house situated in a small village. Although not listed, the house appears to date from the late 19th century and may be older. A very prominent feature of the building is its large, tiled, catslide roof which dominates the appearance of the north side of the house and contributes positively to the distinctive character and appearance of the building as a whole.
4. The proposal includes construction of a large two-storey extension on the north side of the building which would result in the loss of the catslide roof, seriously harming the architectural interest and general appearance of the property. The extension would have the same width as the main body of the house, resulting in a large, mainly blank, two-storey gable end wall facing north. The ridge of the extension's roof would be at the same height as the ridge of the host building and, as a consequence of the width of the development, the roof would have a significantly shallower pitch than the other roofs of the house. The result would be a tall, bulky and incongruous extension which would dominate the north, east and west elevations of the house and would detract from the character and appearance of the property as a whole. This would be contrary to the aims of Policy RES 11 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006 (LP) which seeks to ensure that extensions to dwellings are in keeping with the existing property.

5. All Saints Church, a listed grade I building, stands close by to the east of the appeal property. Whilst views of the appeal property are restricted by trees in summer, the proposed extension would be open to view from the churchyard in winter. Because of its size and unsympathetic design, the appearance of the extended property would detract from the setting of the listed building and from the character and appearance of the local area as a whole, contrary to the requirements of LP Policy STRAT 1.
6. In 2002, planning permission was granted for a scheme of alteration and extension the same as the development currently proposed. However, each case must be decided on its own merits in accordance with planning policies prevailing at the time. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Whilst the appeal scheme includes removal of an incongruous mono-pitch roofed, two-storey extension on the west side of the house and improvements to the flat-roofed, single-storey projection at the front of the house, overall the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and to the local area. Consequently the development would not represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework and the earlier planning permission carries little weight in favour of the proposal.
7. The proposed development includes construction of a three bay detached garage to the east of the proposed extension. The application drawings provide limited detail of what is proposed and it would appear that the building would be a plain, utilitarian structure, with a shallow pitched roof, which would fail to complement the character and appearance of the house. Therefore, it is not, clear that the proposed garage would meet the aims of good design as sought by the Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J A B Gresty

INSPECTOR