

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber at the Guildhall, Gainsborough on Wednesday 10 February 2016.

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

Councillor Owen Bierley
Councillor David Cotton
Councillor Hugo Marfleet
Councillor Jessie Milne
Councillor Giles McNeill
Councillor Roger Patterson
Councillor Judy Rainsforth
Councillor Thomas Smith

Apologies Councillor David Bond

Membership No substitutes were appointed.

In Attendance:

Mark Sturgess Chief Operating Officer
Eve Fawcett-Moralee Strategic Lead – Economic Development and Neighbourhoods
Jonathan Cadd Principal Development Management Officer
Ian Elliott Senior Development Management Officer
Stuart Tym Lincs Legal Adviser
Dinah Lilley Governance and Civic Officer

Also Present 24 members of the public
Councillor Angela White - Visiting Ward Member
Alan Robinson- Strategic Lead Democratic and Business Support
Oliver Fytche – Taylor - Team Manager, Spatial Planning,
Strategic Growth
Elaine Poon – LDO and Major Projects Officer

59 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

60 MINUTES

Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 13 January 2016.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 13 January 2016, be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

61 APOLOGY

Councillor McNeill made the following statement:

“At the planning meeting on the 13th January 2016 Ms Lynette Swinburne of Globe Consultants made representations on behalf of Beal Developments Limited in support of the proposed development off Larch Lane, Nettleham, under reference number 132847. Ms Swinburne said that no objections to this application were outstanding. I enquired of the Planning Officer to confirm if all consultees made no objection. The planning officer’s answer was insufficiently clear to me and I concluded that Ms Swinburne had lied to the committee. Subsequently I have sought clarification on this matter and I have satisfied myself that the statement was fair and accurate. I therefore fully retract my statement that her comment was a lie. I offer Ms Swinburne and the committee my unreserved apologies for any confusion or upset that I may have caused, by this misunderstanding and error.”

62 MEMBERS’ DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Cotton declared a personal interest in Item 5, 133141, Knaith Park, Gainsborough in that the site was within a parish in which he ministered.

Councillor Patterson declared that all Councillors knew one of the objectors for Item 2, 132847, Larch Avenue, Nettleham as he was employed by the Council in a civic capacity.

Councillor Smith declared that he was the ward member for the site referred to in Paper C, Thorpe Farm, Tealby.

63 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT CHANGES TO PLANNING POLICY

There were no government updates to report.

64 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION (PL.10 15/16)

RESOLVED that the applications detailed in report PL.10 15/16 be dealt with as follows:-

1 – 132418 – Cherry Willingham

Outline planning application for erection of up to 18 dwellings with all matters reserved at Bleak Farm, High Street, Cherry Willingham.

The Principal Development Management Officer noted that the Committee had undertaken a site visit for the application, and also read out an email which had been received from the applicant’s agent.

Paul Moore of Cherry Willingham Parish Council addressed the Committee stating that he was disappointed that detailed comments submitted by the Parish Council were not included within the report. The Parish Council had no objection in principle to development, however it was keen to maintain the street scene and character of the area. It was important to keep existing features, the building styles and the orchard, these could all be preserved whilst still meeting the commercial aspirations of the applicant. The Parish Council requested that Reserved Matters be determined by the Committee, in particular the details of the barn conversion.

It was affirmed that the Reserved Matters for the application could be considered by the Committee. Members noted that the site visit had been useful and it had been seen that the brick wall facing the street was a mixture of different types of bricks, some of which were not worth preserving. Members also questioned the merits of retaining the barn, farmhouse and orchard, although agreed that the design needed to complement the existing street scene.

Acknowledging that many of the details regarding design would be included within the Reserved Matters application, which would be required to be submitted to the Committee, Members were happy to move the recommendation. The proposal was seconded and voted upon, and it was subsequently **AGREED** that:

the decision to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to conditions and be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer upon the completion and signing of an agreement under section 106 of the Planning Act 1990 (as amended) pertaining to:-

- The provision of 25% affordable housing units, 3 dwellings on site and a contribution of and on offsite contribution of £26,638.50.
- The provision of not less than 3% of the total site area dedicated for use as Public Open Space and measures to ensure its ongoing management and maintenance;

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

2 – 132847 - Nettleham

Hybrid planning application for a change of use to provide areas of public open space - sports facilities, including outline planning application for the erection of up to 200 dwellings and associated roads and infrastructure with access to be considered and not reserved for subsequent applications on land off Larch Avenue, Nettleham.

Prior to consideration of the application the Principal Development Management Officer noted that the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan had been to referendum and received much support, and was due for adoption by West Lindsey District Council at the meeting on 3 March 2016. Because of the support for the Plan and the imminence of its adoption significant weight could be afforded to it. The Officer then read out a number of recently received representations.

Nettleham Parish Council had requested that the Secretary of State call the application in for determination, raising a number of concerns, principally

- 75% of the land was unallocated within the Neighbourhood Plan
- 150 houses was significantly above the upper limit of the x50 houses per allocated site. The concept of a series of smaller estates around the village rather than one larger estate had been supported previously by the High Court
- the existence of a 5 year supply being inconclusive in recent appeal decisions

Notice had been received from the National Planning Casework Unit informing that the Secretary of State would only consider the application against the call-in policy once the Committee was minded to approve the application, should the Authority refuse the application then the Secretary of State would have no further interest in the call-in request for this case.

Three further letters of representation had also been received raising issues with highways and flooding, and also the undermining of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Parish Councillor John Evans spoke on the application noting that the Nettleham Plan was the first to include site allocations, and of those residents that had voted in the referendum, 91% had supported the proposals. The document had been considered by the Council's Prosperous Communities Committee and recommended for Council approval. Neighbourhood Plans were of national significance and the National Planning Policy Framework instructed that regard be given. The application was for development four times greater than any proposed in the Plan and walking distances from the site to facilities was twice the recommendation within the NPPF, therefore sustainability was questioned. Local character, history and landscape should be preserved.

Lynette Swinburne, addressed the meeting on behalf of the applicant citing the key issue of housing growth at the heart of the NPPF and the need to demonstrate a five year land supply for housing. Government policy set out that where a Local Plan was out of date there should be a presumption in favour of development unless any adverse impacts outweighed the benefits. Recent appeal decisions had affirmed the lack of a five year supply and this should override the housing policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. There were no objections from statutory consultees so no adverse impacts to outweigh the benefits of the proposals. The application was in accordance with many policies within the Neighbourhood Plan, and was only in contravention of policies H-1 and H-7. Part of the site was allocated for housing within policy H-7, so permission should be granted.

John Hill, resident of Nettleham, spoke against the application, stating that Neighbourhood Plans protected communities from being overwhelmed by development, and whilst some leakage was expected, this application was significant. Mr Hill reiterated several of the points raised by the Parish Council and asserted that if the application was approved it would send a clear message to other communities in Neighbourhood Plan preparation that it was a waste of time. Officers make recommendations – but Councillors make decisions.

Councillor Mrs White, spoke as Ward Member for Nettleham and clarified the status of the availability of parental choice for both primary and secondary school places.

The Principal Development Management Officer affirmed that the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan held sufficient weight to be a policy document for consideration alongside other relevant policies. Clarification was given that the Secretary of State had reserved the right to call the application in only should the Committee be minded to grant approval, so the decision still had to be made at this stage.

The Committee debated the application at some length and Councillor McNeill cited detailed statistics which demonstrated that West Lindsey had a clear deliverable five year supply of housing land. Members agreed that where communities had undertaken a great deal of work to produce a Neighbourhood Plan they should be supported and this stance was upheld by the Central Lincolnshire Joint Planning Committee. Support for the Neighbourhood Plan echoed the principles of Localism and Devolution. Whilst other policies could not be ignored the aspirations in the Neighbourhood Plan were clear and Members of the Committee proposed refusal of the application.

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused on the basis of the Neighbourhood Plan policies H-1 and H-7, and also Local Plan saved policies STRAT12, NBE 10 and 20, and NPPF 198 paragraphs 14 and 58. Officers advised that if the five year land supply was used as a reason to refuse it needed to be clearly backed up with evidence, so caution should be exercised.

On being voted upon it was agreed unanimously that permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

Reasons

The proposed development of 200 dwellings which would extend into the open countryside beyond the site allocated in the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan (2014 – 2031) for approximately 50 dwellings under Policy H-7 would undermine the aims and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan which proposes development across the settlement so that it can be successfully integrated into the village thereby protecting its character, infrastructure, residential amenity and accessibility by means other than motor vehicles. It would unbalance the village of Nettleham by reason of the number of dwellings proposed relative to the scale of the village; the concentration of development on a single large site. No essential need has been demonstrated for this development which will extend beyond the planned settlement limits and lead to the loss of open countryside. The proposal which is contrary to Nettleham Neighbourhood Policies: H1 and H7 and Saved Policies: STRAT1, STRAT12, NBE 10 and NBE20 of the West Lindsey Local Plan (First Review) 2006 cannot be considered sustainable development.

Note the committee adjourned for a five minute comfort break at 8pm.

3 – 133559 - Cherry Willingham

Planning application to demolish existing outbuildings and erection of five dwellings at Walk Farm, Green Lane, Cherry Willingham.

The Development Management Officer informed the Committee of additional representations received, raising issues of development on greenfield land, and problems with vehicles turning right. Policies NBE 9, 10, 18 and 20 were cited as reasons for refusal, however policies 9 and 18 were not relevant and the others were covered within the report. There were however concerns regarding ownership of the land on which the passing places for vehicles were proposed, which would need to be addressed.

Paul Moore of Cherry Willingham Parish Council addressed the Committee expressing concerns regarding intrusion into the open countryside and also the cumulative effect of the proposals alongside other recent applications. There were fears that a satellite settlement could be created which could only be accessed via Green Lane. The distance to facilities was not considered sustainable which would necessitate additional car journeys on a narrow single track lane, which was currently predominantly recreational use. The draft Cherry Willingham Neighbourhood Plan was seeking to improve the lane for its users, however the proposed passing places would be inadequate.

Sam Marriott, agent for the applicant spoke on the application noting that the bridge connecting Green Lane with the High Street had been assessed as acceptable. Although not requested, the applicant had undertaken an ecology report which was also acceptable. It was claimed that the settlement would not be a satellite and would be sustainable with walking distances within the recommended limits. Maintenance of the footpath would be for the benefit of all and the site was currently a redundant eyesore. It would have been possible to propose a greater density however a good design to preserve the local character was preferred.

Members noted that a site visit had been undertaken following the application being deferred at the previous meeting. Whilst on site the Committee had witnessed difficulties encountered by a delivery vehicle negotiating the narrow country lane and felt that the highway was not appropriate for such development.

Members felt that the site was too far away from the edge of the settlement, in the open countryside and would also impede views of Lincoln Cathedral which it was considered important to protect.

It was proposed that the application be refused by reason of policies NBE20, STRAT8 subsection D, STRAT12, CORE9.

The proposal to refuse was seconded and voted on, and it was agreed that permission be **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

Reasons

The decision has been considered against saved policies STRAT1 Development Requiring Planning Permission, STRAT12 Development in the Open Countryside, RES1 Housing Layout, NBE10 Protection of Landscape Character and Areas of Great Landscape Value, CORE10 Open Space and Landscaping within Developments, NBE14 Waste Water Disposal and NBE20 Development on the Edge of Settlements of the adopted West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006 in the first instance and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance. In light of this it is considered that the proposal is located in the open countryside and represents an unsustainable form of development. The proposal does not meet any of the exceptions criteria within STRAT 12 and is considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the local area and adversely impacts on the views towards Lincoln Cathedral. The access lane to the site is considered not suitable for additional traffic and will have an adverse impact on highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to local policy STRAT 1, STRAT 8, STRAT 12, NBE 10 and NBE 20.

4 - 133237 – Caistor

Planning application to erect one dwelling with detached garage rear of 5 Mill Lane, Caistor.

It was questioned whether the application would have been delegated to officers for determination had the applicant not been related to a West Lindsey Councillor. This was affirmed.

The recommendation to approve was moved, seconded and it was agreed that permission be **GRANTED**.

5 - 133845 - Gainsborough

Planning application for the construction of seven dwellings - resubmission of previous application 133141, on land off Heynings Close, Knaith Park, Gainsborough.

Note Councillor McNeill declared that he had a pecuniary interest in the application and left the room during consideration of the report.

Steve Gelder addressed the meeting as the applicant stating that during a consultation exercise the proposals had received overwhelming support and even offers to purchase properties. Drainage issues and other objections had all been addressed, there was an hourly bus service and an excellent cycle network, making the site sustainable. The proposals included retirement bungalows, and unlike development taking place in villages which benefitted Lincoln, this would promote the economic needs of Gainsborough. The site was currently unkempt and would benefit from development.

Members of the Committee debated the application briefly and agreed that in terms of sustainability and the benefits to Gainsborough the proposals were acceptable.

The intention to include bungalows in the development would mean that older people could downsize whilst remaining local, freeing up larger properties to allow young families to move into the village.

The Principal Development Management Officer noted that the proposals were contrary to Local Plan policies thus the recommendation to refuse, however if the Committee was minded to approve the application, conditions would need to be applied to the permission and details on a s106 agreement drawn up.

It was moved and seconded that permission be granted for reasons of infrastructure, sustainability and proximity to Gainsborough. It was felt that the decision would not set a precedent as the situation was unique. On being voted upon it was **AGREED** that:

the decision to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to the conditions set out below be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer upon the completion and signing of an agreement under section 106 of the Planning Act 1990 (as amended) pertaining to:-

- The provision of affordable housing

Reasons

The decision has been considered against STRAT1: Development Requiring Permission, STRAT3: Settlement Hierarchy, STRAT8: Small Rural Settlements, RES1: Housing Layout and Design, RES6: Affordable Housing, NBE10: Protection of Landscape Character in Development Proposals of the adopted West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006 in the first instance and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is considered that the application site benefits from a regular bus service along with two different school bus services. This along with the proximity to Gainsborough is felt to be sustainable and weigh in favour of development. Furthermore consideration has been given to the infrastructure and given the small scale of the development and support gained locally it is deemed that the adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development.

Conditions

Conditions stating the time by which the development must be commenced:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To conform with Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Conditions which apply or require matters to be agreed before the development commenced:

2. No development shall take place until, a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Drainage routes shall include all methods by which water may be transferred through the site and shall include such systems as "ridge and furrow" and

"overland flows". The effect of raising Site levels on adjacent property must be carefully considered and measures taken to negate influences must be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure adequate drainage facilities are provided to serve the development, to prevent an increase in the risk of flooding and/or waterlogging on adjacent property, and/or to prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with saved policy NBE14 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006.

3. No development shall take place until details of the external facing materials, roofing materials and the materials of the boundary treatments to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out only using the materials approved

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance of the development and to enhance the setting of the Listed Building in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and saved Policy STRAT 1 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006.

4. No development shall take place until, a scheme of landscaping including details of the size, species and position or density of all trees to be planted, fencing and walling, and measures for the protection of trees to be retained during the course of development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that a landscaping scheme to enhance the development is provided in accordance with saved policies STRAT 1, CORE 10 and RES 1 West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006.

5. No development shall be commenced until an Estate Street Phasing and Completion Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Estate Street Phasing and Completion Plan shall set out the development phases and the standards that estate streets serving each phase of the development will be completed.

Reason: To ensure that the estate streets serving the development are completed and thereafter maintained to an acceptable standard in the interest of residential / highway safety; to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the highways infrastructure serving the development; and to safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and users of the highway.

6. No development shall be commenced until details of the proposed arrangements for management and maintenance of the proposed streets within the development have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The streets shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance details until such time as an agreement has been entered into under section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or a private management and maintenance company has been established.

Reason: As recommended by the Highway Authority in the interests of highway safety and in accordance with West Lindsey Local Plan First Review Policy STRAT1 and RES1.

7. No development shall be commenced until full engineering, drainage, street lighting and constructional details of the streets proposed for adoption have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall, thereafter, be constructed in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety; to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the highways infrastructure serving the approved development; and to safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and users of the highway.

8. No development shall take place before a scheme has been agreed in writing by the local planning authority for the construction of a 1.8 metre wide footway link from the proposed new access to the existing footway on Station Road, together with arrangements for the disposal of surface water run-off from the highway at the frontage of the site. The agreed works shall be fully implemented before any of the dwellings are occupied. Or in accordance with a phasing arrangement to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure safe access to the site and each dwelling/building in the interests of residential amenity, convenience and safety.

9. No dwellings shall be commenced before the first 25 metres of estate road from its junction with the public highway, including visibility splays, as shown on drawing number DD434-A1/001 dated April 15 has been completed.

Reason: In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway and the safety of the users of the site and to enable calling vehicles to wait clear of the carriageway of Heynings Close.

Conditions which apply or are to be observed during the course of the development:

10. With the exception of the detailed matters referred to by the conditions of this consent, the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings: A1/001 Rev 0 dated April 15, A1/002 Rev 0 dated April 15, A1/003 Rev 0 dated April 15, A1/004 Rev 0 dated April 15, A1/005 Rev 0 dated April 15, A1/006 Rev 0 dated April 15, A1/007 Rev 0 dated April 15, A1/008 Rev 0 dated April 15. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans and in any other approved documents forming part of the application.

Reason: To ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the approved plans and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and saved policy STRAT 1 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006.

Conditions which apply or relate to matters which are to be observed following completion of the development:

11. No dwelling shall be occupied until the estate streets affording access to those dwellings has been completed in accordance with the Estate Street Development Plan.

Reason: To ensure that the estate streets serving the development are completed and maintained to the approved standard, and are available for use by the occupants, and other users of the development, in the interest of highway safety; to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the highways infrastructure serving the

approved development; and to safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and users of the highway.

12. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure that an approved landscaping scheme is implemented in a speedy and diligent way and that initial plant losses are overcome, in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and in accordance with West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006 Saved Policies STRAT 1, STRAT 12 and CORE 10.

Notes to the applicant

1. The Applicant is advised to obtain the written approval of the Local Highway Authority for the details required under Condition 11, prior to the submission of such details to the Local Planning Authority in seeking to discharge the said condition. Such details, as may be submitted to the Local Highway Authority, could be subject to technical and safety assessments / audits, which may result in changes to the layouts and alignments as shown on any indicative layout(s) approved by virtue of the planning permission. The applicant is advised that the Local Planning Authority may reject details submitted to them for the discharge of the condition without evidence of technical approval from the Local Highway Authority.
2. The applicant is advised to discharge condition 6, that the Local Planning Authority requires a copy of a completed agreement between the applicant and the local highway authority under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 or the constitution and details of a Private Management and Maintenance Company confirming funding, management and maintenance regimes.
3. Prior to the submission of details for any access works within the public highway you must contact the Divisional Highways Manager on 01522 782070 for application, specification and construction information.

Note Councillor Cotton wished for it to be recorded that he had abstained from voting for reasons of the personal interest declared.

Note Councillor McNeill returned to the meeting.

6 - 133848 - Lea

Planning application to erect two storey extension to rear of property at 43 Gainsborough Road, Lea, Gainsborough.

Mr Smith, neighbouring resident, spoke in objection to the application stating that whilst there would be no impact on the street scene there would be an overpowering impact on the conservatory on his property. The extension would be almost as big as the existing property, and although a hip roof had been suggested this had been declined. Mr Smith was not against a sympathetic extension, but he asked the Committee to visit the site and then refuse this proposal to enable the applicant to submit plans for a smaller extension.

It was immediately suggested that the Committee undertake a site visit to assess the impact and the line of the sunlight.

On being moved, seconded and voted upon, it was **AGREED** that a **SITE VISIT** be undertaken.

65 RIVERSIDE GATEWAY LOCAL DEVELOPMENT ORDER CONSULTATION (PL.12 15/16)

The report was presented to the Committee by the Strategic Lead for Economic Development and Neighbourhoods. The Council had been awarded Housing Zone status in 2015 for Greater Gainsborough, and the Riverside Gateway site at Carr Lane was the first of the strategic site to be brought forward. The site was located on Carr Lane/ Lea Road and was one of the most visible derelict sites on a main route into Gainsborough. It was proposed that a Local Development Order be made to grant Outline Planning Permission to the site for housing led redevelopment of up to 450 dwellings. A Local Development Order was a new mechanism promoted by the Government to encourage development by simplifying and de-risking the planning process to incentivise landowners and developers to bring forward development at an accelerated pace.

Various planning considerations had been assessed by officers and it was felt that the impact of the proposed development could be mitigated by conditions contained within the LDO. It was therefore recommended that the LDO be endorsed for consultation.

Members debated the merits of the proposals, but some felt that it was crucial for the opportunity to be taken to establish a further crossing of the River Trent. It was felt that the current bridge experienced traffic hold ups and a second bridge would alleviate this, and a possible gyratory system would be useful. Other Members felt that the current road access system to Gainsborough was adequate and it was affirmed that whilst a second bridge may be an aspiration of all, it was unlikely, as the level of housing increase was insufficient to support this.

There was a need to encourage people to come to Gainsborough, and there was much to be proud of. Congratulations were extended to the team producing the report. The Chairman of the Prosperous Communities Committee noted that the report had been considered at the last meeting and represented a good opportunity for Gainsborough. Economically it was the right time to make a difference and development of the area could be a catalyst for further growth.

RESOLVED that the Riverside Gateway Local Development Order be endorsed for Consultation.

66 PRE-CONSIDERATION SITE VISIT BY MEMBERS FOR PLANNING APPLICATION 133466 – LAND ADJACENT TO THORPE FARM, THORPE LANE, TEALBY. (PL.13 15/16)

The Principal Development Management Officer introduced the report which sought agreement for Members to undertake a site visit for a proposed development which, being in an Area of Great Landscape Value, would normally be recommended for refusal, however was proposed to be unique. The application was to be presented to the Committee for decision, so it was important that Members understood the context of the site. Members agreed that a mediocre design in such a location would not be appropriate and a site visit would be useful.

RESOLVED that a site visit be undertaken prior to consideration of the application at Planning Committee.

66 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS

A number of appeal decisions had been received from the Planning Inspectorate which were listed appended to the agenda, of which six had been dismissed, and two allowed.

Disappointment was expressed at the two that had been lost by the Council. It was noted that the wording of the Welton appeal decision was virtually the same as a previously upheld appeal at Saxilby, which raised concerns. Inconsistencies in policy interpretation would be monitored. Thanks were expressed to officers for their support with statements of case.

RESOLVED that the determination of appeals be noted.

The meeting concluded at 9.34 pm.

Chairman