

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber at the Guildhall, Gainsborough on Wednesday 21 January 2015.

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 substitute was appointed

In Attendance:
Derek Lawrence Interim Planning Manager
Zoë Raygen Principal Development Management Officer
Jonathan Cadd Principal Development Management Officer
Diane Krochmal Housing and Communities Project Officer
Dinah Lilley Governance and Civic Officer

Also Present 20 members of the public

The Chairman welcomed Derek Lawrence and introduced him to the Committee as the Interim Planning Manager, and also welcomed back Zoë Raygen.

55 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

56 MINUTES

Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10 December 2014.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10 December 2014, be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

57 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Caine declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 1 as he was the Chairman of the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB Management Group. Councillor Caine also declared that all Members of the Committee had a non-pecuniary interest in that they knew the applicant for Item 2 as he was a fellow Councillor.

Reverend Councillor Cotton questioned the implications regarding Item 3 and the Licensing Committee, however it was clarified that there were no changes proposed to the licence and the proposal was simply to align the club opening hours with the existing licence.

Councillor Bierley declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 1 in that he was on the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB Management Group, and also noted that all Councillors had a non-pecuniary interest in Item 5, as the applicant was West Lindsey District Council.

Councillor Leaning declared that with regard to Item 4, Scothern Nurseries was mentioned in the report and whilst the establishment was owned by a relative he had no pecuniary interest, however in the interest of public perception he would not take part in the deliberation on the application.

Councillor Curtis declared that for Item 4, he would remove himself from the Committee and speak as Ward Member on the application.

58 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT CHANGES TO PLANNING POLICY

There were no recent Government updates to report.

59 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION (PL.12 14/15)

RESOLVED that the applications detailed in report PL.12 14/15 be dealt with as follows:-

1 – 131591 – Claxby

Planning Application for a glamping camping site on land to rear of the Old Smithy, Mulberry Road, Claxby.

The Principal Development Management Officer noted that a site visit had taken place for the application. A number of additional representations had been received, a letter from Sir Edward Leigh MP was read out verbatim, in which Sir Edward expressed support for the objectors to the application and stated that he thought the

proposals unacceptable. Comments had also been received from the local Ward Member Councillor Regis, these issues were covered within the report. Objections had also been received from Cardiff and Grantham and five letters of support had been received, all of which were covered in the report.

Julia Lindley-Baker of the Parish Council, addressed the meeting noting that several formal and also informal meetings had taken place during which 82% of comments received had been in objection to the proposals. Whilst some measures had been taken to address issues raised, concerns still existed regarding the location of the site, its impact on residents with potential for noise, disturbance, security, privacy, visual impact etc. There would be disturbance to natural habitat and no benefit to the community. Parking restrictions and sewage disposal would cause additional problems, along with the potential for flooding.

Paul Strong, local resident, then spoke in objection to the application, stating that he felt the objections from statutory consultees had been demoted in the report and the application was unsustainable. No environmental impact assessment had been undertaken and proposed screening was superficial. Where the report stated that two part-time jobs would be created to start with, this implied future plans for expansion. The benefits of tourism had been overstated and other sites which were not in the AONB had not been approved, policies existed to protect the AONB.

Councillor Tom Regis, Ward Member, spoke against the proposals, reiterating the points he had raised at the previous meeting. The site was in the middle of the village and would overlook existing residents, thereby not in an appropriate location. Councillor Regis highlighted the email that had been received from the Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Service and the concerns raised therein.

Note Councillors Milne and McNeill declared that they had been contacted by the objector in order to lobby Sir Edward Leigh MP, but had not been involved in discussion on the application.

Committee Members felt that the site visit had been useful and one Member noted that most of the surrounding gardens had structures of their own including garages and sheds, and did not feel that the tents and bunds would be intrusive. It was generally agreed that tourism in West Lindsey was to be encouraged however the location was of importance.

Concerns were expressed regarding drainage as the land was seen to be boggy despite being uphill. Debate ensued regarding parking facilities and the impact on neighbours from noise, cooking smells etc. It was affirmed that the bund was to be horseshoe shaped to aid drainage, and that the tents were to be inset within the area of the bunds. Conditions could be applied to ascertain native species in the screening, and also to establish changeover times for visitors.

Members considered the application at length, and whilst agreeing that tourism was important, did not feel that this proposal was in the right place, and would be too intrusive for the neighbouring properties.

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused, on being voted upon it was **AGREED** that permission be **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

The development by reason of its location within the centre of the village, its scale and proximity to adjoining properties would detract from residential amenities due to overlooking, noise, nuisance and odours; increase surface water runoff and would degrade the character of the village of Claxby within the AONB contrary to saved Policies STRAT1, NBE9 and NBE10 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 – 131784 – Fenton

Planning application for change of use from B1 business and B8 storage to housing with the erection of four new houses at A Grice & Son Ltd, 40 Lincoln Road, Fenton.

The Principal Development Management Officer informed the Committee that the Environment Agency had withdrawn its objection subject to floor levels being set at an appropriate level to prevent flooding.

Members noted that the site had an extant planning permission for business use, however did not feel that Fenton was a sustainable settlement. Some Councillors felt that the proposals were of sufficiently small scale, new housing was needed in the area and the application had only been submitted for Committee consideration because the applicant was a Councillor.

The Principal Development Management Officer noted that whilst Fenton was not a sustainable settlement, and approval may not necessarily be granted, this was a derelict brownfield site so development would be of benefit, and Officers were not able to prescribe the type of development. The adjacent site was residential.

The recommendations were moved, seconded and voted upon, it was subsequently **AGREED** that permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

Note Councillor McNeill requested that his abstention be noted.

3 – 131923 – Nettleham

Planning application to remove condition 17 of planning permission 125006 granted 3 August 2010, change of opening hours of clubhouse at Longdales Park, Lodge Lane, Nettleham.

Tom Barton, Chairman of the Rugby Club, explain the reasons for the application. The club had 660 members who worked to promote sportsmanship and core ideals. Potential users of the club house expected the establishment to have similar hours to other venues, and whilst it was acknowledged that mistakes had been made in the past causing noise and disturbance, these would not be repeated. Mr Barton

described how the club was dependent upon three types of income stream, and needed the increased income from the clubhouse for advancement of the club.

The proposed conditions and temporary nature of the consent were discussed and it was noted that if neighbouring residents did have any concerns or complaints it was important that these be registered.

Following the recommendations being moved, seconded and voted upon it was **AGREED** that temporary consent for one year subject to conditions be **GRANTED**.

Note Councillor Curtis removed himself from the Committee and Councillor Fleetwood took the Chair for the following item.

4 – 132027 – Scothern

Planning application for the erection of 30 dwellings - 16 open market houses and 14 affordable homes on land at Heath Road, Scothern.

The Principal Development Management Officer informed the Committee that no objections had been received from Anglian Water, and also corrected the recommendation that the decision be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer.

Kathryn Nicholl spoke to the meeting on behalf of the Parish Council stating that there was opposition to the application. Quoting policy NBE20, development on the edge of settlements should enhance, and this would not. The site was on a single lane road with no passing places, and this was frequently used as a rat run. 30 houses would generate around 60 cars and there already existed heavy traffic from the child care facility nearby. The traffic survey was inaccurate and there was scepticism regarding the Housing Need Survey. As well as the issues of congestion and parking, there were concerns regarding flooding and foul water drainage. The proposed density was not appropriate and would be insensitive to the environment.

Neil Kempster, then spoke on behalf of Chestnut homes, describing the need for affordable housing, and that the open market housing was intended to subsidise the affordable. The lack of a five year housing supply for the area made this a Rural Exceptions site. Whilst it was acknowledged that the site was greenfield it was on the edge of the village and in a residential location. Appropriate landscaping was proposed with generous gardens, and the style of dwelling was intended to be a mix of materials in the local vernacular. Scothern was sustainable with a bus service and highway improvements were proposed.

Gavin Smith, local resident, spoke in objection to the proposals, stating that he felt they were inappropriate and opportunistic. The site was isolated from the heart of the village and residents would need cars, however parking provision was inadequate. The highway was poor, used as a rat run and there was no room for parking.

Councillor Curtis spoke as Ward Member for the application, echoing the concerns of the Parish Council. The site was on the edge of the village and near a dangerous junction, HGVs had to use the verge to pass. A local pre-school had recently closed due to lack of demand and there was no shortage of houses on the markets, so the need for housing was questionable. Councillor Curtis then cited policies NBE20, STRAT1 and RES6 as reasons for refusal, and also noted that in the emerging Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Scothern was to be designated as a small village with a maximum of three dwellings per site.

Note Councillors Curtis and Leaning then left the room for deliberation of the application.

Members of the Committee debated the application briefly, noting that the Highways department had raised no objections. Mixed views were expressed regarding the highway issues and the need for housing. A site visit was then proposed and seconded. On being voted upon, it was **AGREED** that a site visit take place on a date to be determined.

Note Councillors Curtis and Leaning returned to the Committee and Councillor Curtis retook the Chair.

5 – 132215 - Gainsborough

Planning application for the erection of 14 dwellings on land South of Corringham Road, between Rosefields and Redman Close, Gainsborough.

The Principal Development Management Officer noted that additional representations had been received and that the Town Council had asked that, if granted, for the completed development not to be sold, provision be made for service vehicles turning, provision for a ban on motorcycles and that there be compensation for the loss of green space. The Principal Development Management Officer read out a statement from Councillor Mick Tinker, Ward Member who had not been able to attend the meeting. Councillor Tinker had raised concerns regarding the loss of the public footpath and the noise and disturbance that would be caused to residents. It was also suggested that as WLDC was the applicant that this be determined by a different authority.

The Highways department had raised issues in that the access arrangements conflicted with a crossing nearby, however this had been included in the original application and the Principal Development Management Officer felt that a way forward could be found and suggested that the recommendation be changed to delegate the decision to grant permission to the Chief Operating Officer subject to negotiation with the Highways department.

Barry Coward of Gainsborough Town Council spoke to raise residents' concerns on the application. The green wedge was shown in the Gainsborough Town Plan and NPPF paragraph 110 refers to amenity value, and paragraph 111 the effective use

of brownfield land. The application should be deferred in order to assess available brownfield land. It was also noted that the site was not on a bus route.

Nick Ethelstone, Special Projects Programme Manager for West Lindsey District Council, spoke as applicant, and gave the background to the proposal, which had emerged following a review of land and property assets, in which opportunities were identified for development potential. The site was particularly sustainable within Gainsborough and there was felt to be a market need for bungalows. The proposals had been designed around the existing footpath and it was proposed to move the existing crossing to align this with the footpath.

Stephen Wharton then spoke as a local resident, claiming that it was not necessary to build on this site as other brownfield land was available. There was a potential risk of localised flooding as the soil was on a clay base. There were existing problems with motorcycles using the route, which would get worse. It was a safe area for children to play which would be lost, it was not desirable to lose this green space, there was too much development in the area causing loss of habitat and disturbance to wildlife.

Note Councillors Fleetwood, Cotton, McNeill and Bierley declared that they were Members of the Policy and Resources Committee which had previously debated the principle of potential development on this piece of land.

It was affirmed that it was not possible for another authority to determine the application. Councillor Cotton proposed a site visit to assess the topography of the area, this was not seconded.

Some Committee Members felt that the loss of the green space would be detrimental and there may have been the possibility of registering this as an Asset of Community Value if a history of usage had been proven. It was confirmed that the Gainsborough Town Plan was not an adopted document so weight could not be afforded to this.

Whilst it was acknowledged that the site was greenfield it was sustainable and would contribute to the five year housing supply.

The recommendation was then moved, seconded and voted upon and it was **AGREED** that the decision to grant permission be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer subject to negotiation with Highways regarding the location of the crossing.

Note Reverend Councillor Cotton and Councillor Rainsforth requested that it be recorded that they had voted against the recommendation.

60 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS

RESOLVED that the determination of appeals be noted.

The meeting concluded at 8.50 pm.

Chairman