

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber at the Guildhall, Gainsborough on Wednesday 12 November 2014.

Present: Councillor Stuart Curtis (Chairman)
Councillor Ian Fleetwood (Vice Chairman)

Councillor Owen Bierley
Councillor Alan Caine
The Revd Councillor David Cotton
Councillor Malcolm Leaning
Councillor Giles McNeill
Councillor Jessie Milne
Councillor Roger Patterson
Councillor Judy Rainsforth

Apologies Councillor Richard Doran

Membership No substitutions were given.

In Attendance:
Mark Sturgess Chief Operating Officer
Simon Sharp Principal Area Development Officer
Russell Clarkson Principal Development Management Officer
Jonathan Cadd Principal Development Management Officer
Dinah Lilley Governance and Civic Officer

Also Present 57 members of the public
Councillor Jackie Brockway
Councillor Reg Shore
Councillor Lewis Strange

41 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

43 MINUTES

Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 15 October 2014.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 15 October 2014, be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

44 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

As several of the applications had been before the Committee previously the Governance and Civic Officer read out previous declarations which had been made.

Councillors Milne and McNeill declared that they worked for Sir Edward Leigh MP who had commented on some applications, however they had not been involved themselves.

Councillor Rainsforth declared that she had a personal interest on Item 5 - Lea, however, in order for there to be no perception of prejudice, she would not take part in the discussion or deliberation.

Councillor Rainsforth had also noted previously that, as she had not been able to attend the site visits for Items 3 and 4 (Burton) and did not know the sites well, she would not take part in these items, however Councillor Rainsforth had now visited the sites so felt she was now able to take part.

With regard to the Sturton application Councillor Milne had declared a non-pecuniary interest as being on the board of ACIS.

Councillor Caine declared a non pecuniary interest in that he knew the applicant for Item 1 (Brigg).

Councillor Cotton declared that he personally knew the applicant for Item 3 (Burton).

Councillor Leaning declared that he had not been present on the site visit for Item 5 (Lea) but was familiar with the area.

Councillor McNeill declared that he had been lobbied with regard to the Solar Farms.

Councillor Curtis declared that he personally knew the applicant for Item 6 (Scothern).

Councillor Fleetwood declared that he had been invited to an information meeting for items 2 and 3 (Solar Farms) but had not expressed any opinions. Councillor Fleetwood also noted that he personally knew several of the speakers at the meeting.

The Principal Area Development Officer declared that he had a conflict of interest on Items 2 and 3 so would leave the room during consideration of these items.

45 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT CHANGES TO PLANNING POLICY

There were no updates to report.

46 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION (PL.10 14/15)

RESOLVED that the applications detailed in report PL.10 14/15 be dealt with as follows:-

1 – 131377 - Westrum Park, Westrum Lane, Brigg

Planning application for change of use of land for siting of six permanent Gypsy and traveller pitches and four transit pitches for a total of 24 additional caravans. Also, the change of use of dayroom building to dwelling at Westrum Park, Westrum Lane, Brigg.

The Principal Area Development Officer updated the meeting on the application. No comments had been received from Network Rail, and North Lincolnshire Council had stated that they had no change to their previous objection. One additional letter from a neighbour has been received but this did not raise any new issues which were not covered by the committee report. Councillor Strange had circulated comments to the Committee Members which were read out verbatim and which cited issues such as drainage, the lack of a footpath on the lane and the fear of over expansion and its impact on the residents of Westrum Lane.

Brigg Town Councillor Donald Campbell addressed the meeting stating how the Town Council had been pro-active in its support of Gypsy and Traveller sites for those families in the Brigg area. There had been difficulties however in establishing transient pitches. The Westrum Park site was a first class example of how a Gypsy and Traveller site should be run, and new generations now wished to establish their homes there. In the six month consultation on the Brigg Neighbourhood Plan, in over 800 comments, not one had referred to any issues with Westrum Park and the Town Council was fully supportive of the Planning Officer's recommendation for approval.

North Lincolnshire Councillors Carl Sherwood and Rob Waltham expressed concerns regarding the site and noted that there had previously been refusals at appeal. Traffic on the dead end road was monitored at 338 vehicles per day and the extension would create further traffic with another 24 caravans proposed, and alterations were pending at the level crossing which led to safety concerns. There was no question regarding the character of the applicant but was there a local connection? Two travelling families were currently trespassing in Brigg – would these be accepted on this site? It was not felt that the bungalow conversion from day room to residential qualified as traveller accommodation. The report cited travelling distances to schools but no assessment had been conducted as to whether these schools had capacity. Concerns were also raised with respect to drainage in the area. There was a transit site in West Lindsey, so any families in need should be allocated there.

Councillor Curtis outlined the policy for the need for gypsy sites within the area.

Councillor Strange as Ward Member then referred to his previous communication and added that he had been contacted by Bigby Parish Council who had noted that the Parish currently accommodated 2/3 of the total allocation in West Lindsey and this was not equitable across the District.

Note Councillor McNeill declared that he personally knew Andrew Percy MP who had commented on the application.

Discussion then ensued with some Members of the Committee noting that the application had been deferred for further negotiation and discussion with consultees and there had been none. The previous appeal decision was not still applicable as access had been improved since that time, however Members were concerned that there was no footpath on Westrum Lane. It was proposed that the addition of a footpath should be included in the conditions along with the drainage requirements. Further discussion took place regarding the possible length and width of the footpath and its specifications. Members also felt that the requirement that the issues be resolved within six months was too long given the impending election as it was felt that if it was necessary for the application to be brought back to the Committee, it should be the existing Committee Members that dealt with it.

It was then moved and seconded that the application be approved with the additional condition requiring a footpath to be established on Westrum Lane, as set out below. It was subsequently voted on and **AGREED** that:

That the decision to **GRANT** planning permission subject to conditions is delegated to the Chief Operating Officer upon the resolution of the issues pertaining to the discharge of foul water from the development and the design and construction of a minimum 1m wide footpath to the east side of Westrum Lane and if such issues are not resolved within four months from the date of this meeting, the matter will be reported back to the next available meeting of the Planning Committee.

Condition 8 – footpath

Prior the construction of any of the additional caravan pitches hereby approved the design, construction specification and location of a footpath to the private access drive shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This footpath shall be completed in strict accordance with the approved plans prior to the first use of any of the approved pitches and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To maintain pedestrian safety in accordance with Saved Policy STRAT1 of the West Lindsey District Local Plan First Draft.

2 – 130886 – Queensway, Sturton By Stow

Planning application for the demolition of 20 garages and the construction of eight affordable dwellings at Queensway, Sturton by Stow.

The Principal Development Management Officer introduced the report reminding the Committee that the application had been considered previously and deferred “to enable negotiation to take place, as it was agreed that the flood mitigation proposed was not sufficiently robust to not exacerbate the current situation.”

Subsequently discussions had been undertaken between the Parish Council, the applicant and various drainage bodies. The Parish Council had since sent in a letter of support as it was now felt that the proposed drainage scheme could improve the current situation.

Chris Elkington then addressed the Committee on behalf of the Parish Council and as a drainage expert, stating that objections had been removed as it was felt that the amendments to the scheme would carry twice as much drainage from the site.

Mr Bates then spoke to the meeting expressing concerns about the capability of the drainage solutions proposed and the potential impact further downstream. Any increase would be a risk and an independent engineer's report would be advisable.

Councillor Reg Shore, in attendance as Ward Member for the site, felt that the solutions to the problems had virtually been reached and he would be monitoring the situation closely.

The Principal Development Management Officer indicated that several drainage experts had been consulted and it was felt that the proposed scheme would be betterment of the existing problems. However, some Members felt that betterment was not sufficient and a complete solution should be sought, but without the scheme approval betterment would not occur.

It was proposed and seconded that a Grampian condition be applied that required that no development take place until drainage works had been completed.

Note Councillor Leaning declared that he personally knew the speaker Mr Elkington, and that he had great respect for his opinion.

Further discussion ensued on matters of riparian ownership and SUDS, and it was accepted that for a scheme of only eight houses the requirements of a S106 would be limited.

On being voted upon it was **AGREED** that the decision to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report plus the additional condition below, to secure the off site drainage works, be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer upon the signing and completion of an agreement under the amended section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 to ensure that the housing is occupied as affordable housing for those people identified as being in need and that the open areas of the site are maintained as public open space.

In the event that the section 106 agreement is not completed and signed within 6 months of the date of this Committee then the application be reported back to the next available Planning Committee following the expiration of that 6 month period.

Before development commences the off-site drainage works identified on drawing no. DB1029 A1SK1 rev B shall be completed in strict accordance with the approved plans and a scheme for its maintenance shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage scheme shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved maintenance scheme.

Reason: To maintain adequate drainage within the area in accordance with saved Policy STRAT1 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Draft and the provision of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3 – 131507 – Birch Holt Farm, Woodcote Lane, Burton

Planning application for construction of a solar farm generating up to 20MW and associated works at Birch Holt Farm, Woodcote Lane, Burton.

The Principal Development Management Officer reminded Members that the application had been deferred from the last meeting and since that time further representations had been received, some of which were letters of support. Comments had also been received from the National Farmers Union (NFU) who supported this use of the land and diversification for a sustainable rural economy. It was further stated that the UK was falling behind the rest of the EU in renewable energy production and that only a minute percentage of Lincolnshire land was used for such purposes.

As requested at the previous Committee meeting further landscaping had been proposed and also further evidence of sequential testing provided. The current use of the land was for biofuel crops and the solar panels would achieve a greater energy output than was currently produced. The appellant had pointed out that they had removed lower quality land that was initially proposed, due to officer and community concerns on visual ground.

Some Councillors noted that some of the support received had been because of lobbying by the applicant and that it was felt that mercenary tactics had been used. The Chairman, having taken advice from the monitoring officer, pointed out that lobbying was legitimate, however if anyone felt that this amounted to harassment then this was a police matter, and this should not be taken into account in the determination of the application.

George Robinson, a local resident, addressed the Committee and stated that having been against the first application, now felt that the applicant had listened to the views of the community and had produced a good scheme which could be supported.

Niels Kroninger, Managing Director of AEE Reewables, noted that dialogue had been carried out with residents and the Parish Council and the scheme had been amended to accord with views expressed. The sequential test had been conducted and other suitable land had not been found, and the land was currently being used for biofuel crops because the soil depth was too shallow for anything else. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust support biodiversity proposals. Nationally, two appeal decisions had recently been allowed on grade 3A land following sequential test arguments, and the visual impact of this proposal would be minimal.

Caroline Platts then spoke in objection to the proposals and showed slides. Mrs Platts felt that the sequential test had not been proven and that the only reason other sites had not been chosen were for economic reasons. A map was shown which depicted other solar farms in the area, twelve of which had materialised in the last four months.

The necessity of this particular site had not been proven, just its preference, this farm could be situated outside of West Lindsey.

Councillor Jackie Brockway, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application stating that she felt that the application contravened policy STRAT12. The necessity of this particular site had not been demonstrated and the visual impact was very relevant to this area. Objectors had suggested alternative sites and the excuse of grid connectivity was a red herring. Councillor Brockway was not convinced of the employment potential nor the biodiversity evidence.

Councillor Reverend David Cotton, also Ward Member for Saxilby echoed the concerns raised by Councillor Brockway.

Some Committee Members felt that this scheme and the other application on the agenda amounted to industrialisation of the countryside. The Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) mattered to local residents and the settlement break between Lincoln and Burton was important. The site is within area designated as a green wedge forming an important settlement break, as protected in National Policy and Local policy STRAT13. In terms of the land still being for agriculture, as it would be used for sheep grazing, it was pointed out that livestock such as sheep were the worst producers of methane gas so any environmental benefits would be counteracted. National Planning Policy stated that countryside should be preserved for its own sake, this site was close to a conservation area and surrounded by farmland, but the proposed solar farm would make it industrial.

Note Councillor McNeill declared that he personally knew Nick Boles MP who had been discussed in the meeting.

Other Councillors thought that the scheme as proposed would be acceptable and that the applicants had complied with the requests made at the previous deferral by improving landscape treatment. The site would still be used as agricultural land and the green wedge would not be lost forever as the development was only temporary.

It was verified by the Case Officer that the development would only be temporary and through planning conditions the land would be required to revert to greenfield upon expiry of the permission after 25 years – this was a significant material consideration and the Officer did not consider development would make the land 'brownfield' due to the temporary nature. Only the southern field fell within the 'green wedge'. A recent Dunholme housing appeal stated that STRAT13 could not be attached full weight – instead consideration should be given as to whether its purpose was compromised.

It was moved, seconded and voted upon that the application be rejected as it would visually compromise the green wedge which was vitally important to the history and character of central Lincolnshire, harm to character and landscape setting of settlements contrary to NBE10 and STRAT13 of the Local Plan and recognised in the emerging local plan.

It was **AGREED** that permission be **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

Reasons

The development proposed would be visually intrusive and would compromise the undeveloped break between settlements resulting in harm to the character and landscape setting of the area including to the Area of Great Landscape Value and to nearby settlements. This would be contrary to the West Lindsey Local Plan (First Review), particularly policies STRAT12, STRAT13 and NBE10, and provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4 – 131496- Land off Middle Street, Burton-by-Lincoln

Planning application for construction of a 20MW solar farm and associated works at Land off Middle Street, Burton-by-Lincoln.

The Principal Development Management Officer pointed out to Members that as the previous application had been refused, the committee was no longer required to consider the cumulative impact. Further representations had been received some of which referred to the transparency of the process that some other letters had not been placed on file, whilst most of the letters had been located there was no record of 3 of these letters having been received. The County Council's Historic Environment Team had reviewed geophysical survey and raised no objections.

The applicant had supplied the evidence of their sequential testing as requested and proposed an increase in landscape screening. A comparison had been requested which showed the difference between land uses in terms of energy production, this compared as 1.5GW pa for crops and 19.3GW pa for solar panels. There was a national requirement to seek renewable energy sources as carbon heavy power stations were coming to the end of their life. The agricultural land would not be lost. External lighting was not proposed by the applicant – a planning condition could be applied.

Oliver Kirkham, agent for RGE Energy, spoke for the application stating that close work had been undertaken with the Council and all consultees, and no objections had been received. The site would be well screened with additional scrub and hedgerow and not visible from any properties or from the A46. The scheme would provide power for 4,400 homes.

Caroline Platts spoke in objection to the application and showed slides. Mrs Platts stated that the the reasons put forward for the choice of site were based on cost and convenience to the applicant, not because no other sites were available. It was not up to the local authority to solve the applicant's connection problems. A map was shown depicting the number of solar farms currently in the area, and noted that 40 other applications were pending. Residents felt strongly that Councillors should uphold their own policies.

Councillor Jackie Brockway, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application, stating that the site did not have to be in West Lindsey. Despite the additional landscaping proposed there would still be an adverse impact which would detract from the rural character of the area. Whilst renewable energy solutions needed to be sought there was no required quota for the county to fulfill. This was open countryside,

a valuable green wedge and agricultural land. Residents had been able to find alternative sites.

Councillor Reverend David Cotton, as the other Ward Member for Saxilby, reiterated Councillor Brockway's comments.

Committee Members debated the application considering many of the concerns with item 3 still applicable here, again citing harm to the Area of Great Landscape Value, the counter-productive methane production from sheep and the loss of agricultural land for 25 years (a lifetime generation). Lincolnshire was being targeted because it still had grid capacity. Development would be contrary to Local Plan policies NBE10, STRAT12 and STRAT13. Green wedges were highly protected by national policy, and countryside should be safeguarded for its own sake. The green wedge is important to preserve character of villages, including Burton and Riseholme.

It was moved, seconded and voted upon that the application be rejected citing the protection of green wedges and the loss of agricultural land. It was **AGREED** that permission be **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

Reasons

The development proposed would be visually intrusive and would compromise the undeveloped break between settlements resulting in harm to the character and landscape setting of the area including to the Area of Great Landscape Value and to nearby settlements. This would be contrary to the West Lindsey Local Plan (First Review), particularly policies STRAT12, STRAT13 and NBE10, and provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Note the Committee adjourned for a comfort break at 9.07 and reconvened at 9.14pm

5 – 131364 – 89 Gainsborough Road, Lea

Outline planning application for erection of four dwellings - access to be considered and not reserved for subsequent applications, at 89 Gainsborough Road, Lea.

Note Councillor Jessie Milne removed herself from the Committee to enable herself to speak freely as the Ward Member, in order to represent her residents, and then left the room during the deliberation.

The applicant, Carl Godley, stated that he had consulted the NPPF to seek objective evidence to support his application, and believed that all criteria had been met in terms of sustainability. It was the responsibility of the Planning Committee to seek solutions not problems.

Councillor Milne then spoke as Ward Member representing residents against the application. Lea was a small village without amenities, which meant that a trip to the shops meant a bus ride, for which the service was limited and may not even be accessible for the elderly. The development would cause overlooking, overshadowing and loss of privacy to existing residents. There were questions of highway safety on

what was a busy road, and noise and disturbance on the narrow access driveway. The site was much lower than existing properties and there were already flooding problems elsewhere in the area, and there were no longer trees on the site to soak up rainfall. There was no need for additional properties as there were currently 14 properties for sale in Lea. The application had been dismissed at appeal twice.

Note Councillor Milne then left the meeting during deliberation on the application.

The Committee then debated the application and were informed that since the appeal dismissals there had been a change in policy that the District did not currently have a five year supply of housing. It was clarified that the application was for outline permission only and no layout was proposed at this point, although access was to be considered.

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused for reasons of the impact on neighbouring properties, loss of open space important to the character of the settlement, and concerns of potential flooding.

On being voted upon it was **AGREED** that permission be **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

1. The proposal would have an adverse effect on the general quality and character of the area and would mean the loss of space important to the character of the settlement. This is contrary to saved policy NBE 10 of the West Lindsey Local Plan Review 2006 and would not accord with guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining property by reason of noise disturbance and have a significant adverse impact on the existing property by movement of vehicles. This is contrary to saved policy RES 3 and STRAT 7 of the West Lindsey Local Plan Review 2006 and will not accord with guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Note Councillor Milne returned to the meeting.

6 - 131757 - Land adjacent to South Dene, Off Langworth Road, Scothern

Planning application for erection of eight dwellings on land adjacent to South Dene, Off Langworth Road, Scothern.

The Principal Development Management Officer informed the meeting that a response had been received from the Environment Agency that it had withdrawn objections to the proposals subject to a planning condition on surface water drainage and that the outline scheme was satisfactory. It was proposed that Condition 2 be modified to provide further details of the maintenance and management of the surface water drainage system and to provide detailed network calculations. Anglian Water had confirmed there was sufficient capacity in the wastewater treatment works and foul sewerage Network.

Note Councillors Cotton, Fleetwood and Curtis declared personal interests in that they knew the applicant and local residents interested in the application.

David Mason attended the meeting to voice residents' concerns. The site was outside of the settlement boundary contrary to the development plan. Until recently, water was held between medieval ridge and furrow and Main Street properties at high risk of surface water flooding. The proposals would exacerbate the current situation and question proposed SUDS scheme and maintenance responsibilities. It was suggested that an archaeological topographical survey be undertaken, as per County Archaeologist recommendation.

James Rigby, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee noting that the development would be an appropriate edge to the village and there would be no harm to residential amenity. The visibility at the proposed access was good and the road would be adopted. Meetings had been held with drainage agencies and objections had been removed.

Clive Mason also spoke on behalf of the applicant, stating that he was a chartered civil engineer and he was satisfied that the development would reduce the potential for flooding.

Councillor Curtis was the Ward Member for the site and stated that in the settlement hierarchy in the emerging Local Plan, a development of up to nine houses would be acceptable. Despite flooding concerns, the site was in Flood Zone 1 and a SUDS drainage scheme was proposed to drain the site to a central pond to be adopted. Development would contribute towards an identified housing need and it was a sustainable location. Consider benefits would outweigh any adverse impacts. Councillor Curtis did support Parish Council concerns which question the contribution towards affordable housing, and a proportion of any funding would be better directed towards a community provision which was needed.

The Principal Development Management Officer reminded the Committee of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and affirmed that the applicant had been engaged with multi-agency meetings and all engineers were satisfied with the SUDS scheme. It was acknowledged that the archaeological condition had been omitted and this should be included upon planning permission.

There were three tests in Planning Law for a s106 planning obligation to be a planning consideration. The obligation must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. As the provision of a community facility could not be shown to be necessitated by the proposed development, it would not meet the legal test.

The Officer confirmed that condition 6 would relate to obscured glazing to protect 48 Main Street and would be secured in perpetuity.

The recommendation to approve was then moved, seconded and voted upon and it was subsequently **AGREED** that the decision to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report and the additional conditions agreed at the

meeting be delegated to the Head of Development and Neighbourhoods upon the completion and signing of an agreement under section 106 of the Planning Act 1990 (as amended) pertaining to:-

A contribution of £80,000 towards the provision of affordable housing within a five mile radius of the application site.

And, in the event of the s106 not being completed and signed by all parties within 6 months from the date of this Committee, then the application be reported back to the next available Committee meeting following the expiration of the 6 months.

2. No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage strategy should demonstrate that the surface water run-off generated up to and including the 100 year plus climate change critical storm will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion **and details of the surface water network and detailed network calculations.**

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system and to accord with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

6. Prior to first occupation of the *dwelling at plot 8 as shown on drawing 671G-13C*, the first floor window(s) in the north facing elevation of the dwelling shall be glazed in obscure glass and thereafter retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of nearby residential properties and avoid overlooking in accordance with West Lindsey Local Plan First Review Policy STRAT1.

7. No development hereby permitted shall take place until a Scheme of Archaeological Works (on the lines of 4.8.1 in the Lincolnshire Archaeological Handbook (2012)) in accordance with a written scheme of investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme of works shall consist of a detailed topographic survey of the site and include provision for the publication and dissemination of analysis and records and the provision for archive deposition. The Scheme of Archaeological Works shall be implemented strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the preparation and implementation of an appropriate scheme of archaeological mitigation and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Planning application to vary condition 6 of planning permission 130050 granted 8 August 2013-increase park home units to 65 on Land at Burton Waters, Lincoln.

The Principal Development Management Officer informed Members that additional information had been received from the applicant that the proposal was a request only to amend an existing condition on an application already granted. The proposal was for a modest increase from 56 to 65 residential park home units restricted to over 55 year olds. The application site is completely separate from the adjacent “Burton Lakes” development.

Whilst some objectors had sent in representations these referred to the whole development. The Case Officer explained, under planning law, the Committee could only consider the question of the conditions, not the overall principle of development. It would form a new permission and that the original permission would still stand regardless.

Councillor Cotton, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Committee, citing the unique nature of Burton Waters as a live-work marina setup, and pointed out that there had been a specific reason for the number of dwellings granted at the time of approval. Development not previously appropriate due to views from the escarpment. Concerns with setting precedent for further increases. Questioned the sustainability of the location and public transport provision. Therefore to increase the number would make the development unsustainable, so it was proposed that permission be refused.

The motion was then seconded and voted upon, it was **AGREED** that permission to vary condition 6 of planning permission 130050 granted 8 August 2013 - increase park home units to 65, be **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

Development as proposed would be contrary to the unique nature of the Burton Waters development, and the proposed increase in park home units would be unsustainable by virtue of the limited facilities and public transport provision in this location. This would be contrary to the provisions of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review June 2006, particularly policies STRAT1 and STRAT14, and the National Planning Policy Framework presumption in favour of sustainable development.

8 - 131713 – 14 Whitegate Hill, Caistor

Planning application for erection of one dwelling at 14 Whitegate Hill, Caistor.

Note All Members of the Committee declared that as the applicant was a fellow Councillor, they all had a personal interest.

The Principal Development Management Officer informed the meeting that an additional representation had been received citing encroachment into the countryside

and the impact on trees, however the revised plans, arboricultural report and proposed conditions addressed concerns raised.

Members debated the application briefly and cited the loss of the kindergarten and the extension of development into the open countryside, but noted, however, that no local objections had been received. It was asked that if the application had not been from a West Lindsey District Councillor would it likely have been delegated for officer decision and approved. This was probable.

It was moved, seconded and voted upon that permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

47 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS

RESOLVED that the determination of appeals be noted.

48 CHAIRMAN'S THANKS

The Chairman noted that this was the final meeting to be attended by the Principal Area Development Officer, Simon Sharp, as he was leaving the authority the following day. The Chairman thanked Mr Sharp for all his work with the Committee, he had done a sterling job and the Committee wished him well in his new employment.

The meeting concluded at 10.22 pm.

Chairman