

## WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber at the Guildhall, Gainsborough on Wednesday 19 September 2012.

**Present:** Councillor Stuart Curtis (In the Chair)

Councillor Owen Bierley  
Councillor Alan Caine  
Councillor David Cotton  
Councillor Ian Fleetwood  
Councillor Malcolm Leaning  
Councillor Jessie Milne  
Councillor Malcolm Parish  
Councillor Roger Patterson

**Apologies** Councillor Richy Doran  
Councillor Judy Rainsforth  
Councillor Chris Underwood-Frost

**Membership:** Councillor Parish substituted for Councillor Underwood-Frost

**In Attendance :**  
Nick Ethelstone Area Team Manager  
Paul Seddon Planning Manager, City of Lincoln Council  
Dinah Lilley Governance and Civic Officer

**Also Present** Councillor Giles McNeill  
Councillor William Parry  
8 members of the public

### 28 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

### 29 MINUTES

Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 22 August 2012.

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 22 August 2012 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

### **30 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Parish declared that as he was the Ward Member for Item 2, Welton, and had already made his views clear, he would not take part in the decision making on this application.

Councillor Cotton declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 1 as he knew the applicant, so he would not take part in the deliberation. Councillor Cotton also declared an interest in Item 2 Welton as a practising Minister for the Church of England.

### **31 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT CHANGES TO PLANNING POLICY**

There were no recent changes in Government policy to report.

### **32 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION (PL.07 12/13)**

**RESOLVED** that the applications detailed in report PL.07 12/13 be dealt with as follows:-

#### Item 1 – 128487 - Marton

Planning Application for dry grain store and dry area, Village Farm, Marton.

The Area Development Manager circulated an updated version of the report as recent amendments had not been included in the published report. Members of the Committee took a few minutes to read the update.

Photographs had been submitted by the applicant and these had been included within the officer presentation. Members discussed the proposals and agreed that it would be an improvement for the site to be tidied up, but that assurance would be welcome that the purpose of the proposal would be for agricultural storage.

The CoL Planning Manager clarified that it could be reasonable for the permission to be conditioned to restrict the use as a dry grain store as specified, but that more leeway would allow scope for the tidying of the land. Members also stated that residents needed confidence in the enforcement of breaches.

The committee concluded that there was no valid reason to refuse the application, but that S215 was an enforcement tool which could be implemented should the site become harmful to the amenity of surrounding neighbours.

It was therefore moved, seconded and voted upon that permission be **GRANTED**.

**Note** Councillor Cotton abstained from voting.

Item 2 – 128827 - Welton

Planning application for construction of a new community hall with associated hard landscaping and boundary treatments. Change of use from residential garden land, Welton Methodist Church, Cliff Road, Welton.

Alan Greenaway spoke on behalf of Welton Parish Council, stating that the council was not against the expansion of the Methodist Church facilities, but was concerned at the level of parking in the village centre and that there was to be no additional parking provision as a requirement of the application. Difficulties already existed and Stagecoach buses already experienced problems navigating through parked cars, and there were fears that the bus service could be lost. Concerns were also expressed regarding the disruption that would be caused during construction.

Roger Kuhnel addressed the Committee as a Member of the Methodist Church, stating that the church was not a developer seeking to make financial gain, the reason for the application was to provide a service to the community. The aim was to undertake activities within the proposed hall, many of which echoed Local Plan priorities in terms of community provision. Due to an increase in membership a larger facility was required, alternative sites had been considered but none were found to be suitable. It was acknowledged that there was a parking problem in the area, but this had existed for some time and should have been addressed before. Mr Kuhnel stated that this was an exciting, once in a lifetime opportunity which showed the commitment of the church's membership.

Simon Payne informed Members that the proposed 140 person capacity of the hall would likely bring a further 87 cars, and questioned where they would park, and what the consequences would be. Emails had been received from both Stagecoach and the health centre. The health centre had been denied an extension on the grounds of lack of parking provision. Only two additional spaces were proposed within the new church hall extension. Residents had significant fears regarding the possible loss of the local bus service.

Councillor Malcolm Parish spoke as Ward Member and disputed the statement made that the village hall was the only building available for community use, when there were school halls, sports clubs etc. Whilst supporting the work of the church Councillor Parish was concerned with the welfare of the whole village, and cited incidents of residents being unable to exit their properties because of parked cars. It was also felt that the design of the building was too modern within the setting of listed buildings in the centre of the village. If the proposal was to go ahead in its present form it would split the community, and Councillor Parish recommended a site visit particularly whilst an event was taking place.

Members were disappointed with the lack of response from the County, particularly the highways department, and questions were asked about the enforceability of a travel plan. However, given that highways had stated that they would have no objections if a travel plan was part of the conditions, some members felt that a refusal on highways grounds could prove difficult, so the recommendation to approve was moved.

It was then suggested that the travel plan should be part of the design and access statement rather than a condition of approval. It was then proposed that the application be deferred pending submission of a travel plan. This proposal was then seconded and the mover of the proposal to grant permission then withdrew the motion.

The proposal to defer was voted upon it was **AGREED** to **DEFER** the application pending the submission of a travel plan.

### Item 3 – 128989 - Nettleham

Planning application for proposed 2 storey rear extension-resubmission of 128275, Redbourne, 36 Lodge Lane, Nettleham.

The Area Manager reminded Members that this was a resubmission of an application which had previously been refused, and also dismissed at appeal.

John Evans of Nettleham Parish Council had submitted slides which had been included within the presentation. The photographs showed the existing dwelling and also the comparison between the current and previous applications. The drawing was superimposed on a photograph to depict the impact on the street scene. The proposed extension was larger than the existing dwelling and because the footprint was set further forward than the adjacent row of bungalows it would have a significant impact. The only change to the previously refused application was the roofline, and the failure of the extension to be subordinate to the main dwelling contravened Policies RES11 and STRAT1, and also the Nettleham Village Design Statement.

Chris Henderson, the applicant then addressed the committee, describing how the property was bought with the intention of providing a family home. As an architectural technician, Mr Henderson was keen to have a good quality project. The property had been empty for three years and was in poor condition. Demolition had been considered but it was preferable to retain the 1850s heritage, whilst creating a functional dwelling. There was already a mix of properties on the road, there would be no overshadowing of adjacent properties and neighbouring residents wanted to see the building improved.

Councillor Giles McNeill, Ward Member stated that he had been involved with the application through the Parish Council, and had concerns regarding the size and massing of the proposal, although he did commend the applicant for returning the property to residential use.

Councillor Malcolm Leaning, also Ward Member, knew the property well and quoted the comments from the Planning Inspector when dismissing the appeal. Councillor Leaning felt that these comments still applied as the amended proposal had not significantly reduced the impact. It was then moved that the application be refused again for the same reasons as cited previously.

Other members of the Committee felt that the amendments were adequate to reduce the massing appearance and as the extension was to be at the rear of the property it would be of no detriment to the street scene, and as the external appearance of the original building was to be restored this would improve the neighbourhood. It was then moved and seconded that the application be granted.

The motion to grant the application was then voted upon and **THE MOTION WAS LOST.**

Further discussion ensued and the motion to refuse the application was seconded. Upon being voted upon the motion to **REFUSE** the application was **AGREED.**

Reasons for refusal –

Policies STRAT 1 and RES 11 – the proposed extension by virtue of its massing, scale and position would not be subordinate to the host dwelling. It will introduce an extension that will dominate the traditional cottage style of the original dwelling and the design will detract from the existing character and appearance of the host dwelling and its setting within the street scene.

The proposals are also not in accordance with the principles of the Nettleham Village Design Statement.

The meeting concluded at 7.55 pm.

Chairman