

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, DN21 2NA on 24 August 2016 commencing at 6.00 pm.

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

Councillor Owen Bierley
Councillor Matthew Boles
Councillor Michael Devine
Councillor Giles McNeill
Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne
Councillor Roger Patterson
Councillor Judy Rainsforth
Councillor Thomas Smith

In Attendance:

George Backovic – Principal Development Management Officer
Ian Elliott – Development Management Officer
David Kerfoot – Lincs Legal Advisor
Martha Rees – Lincs Legal Advisor

28 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Councillor David Cotton
Councillor Hugo Marfleet

There were no substitutions.

29 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

There was no public participation.

30 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 27 July 2016.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 27 July 2016, be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

31 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 2 (134622 – Gainsborough) as the applicant was West Lindsey District Council.

32 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT/LOCAL CHANGES IN PLANNING POLICY

There were no updates to report.

33 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

RESOLVED that the applications detailed in report PL.05 16/17 be dealt with as follows:-

33a 131181 - CAISTOR

Outline planning application for the erection of 69 dwellings - access to be considered and not reserved for subsequent applications on land at Brigg Road, Caistor.

The Principal Development Management Officer updated the Committee on further representations which had been received. Comments had been received from Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) Highways department, that there were drainage issues and insufficient information regarding flood risk, and that the application should be refused.

Caistor Town Council had objected on grounds of highways concerns, however had no problem with the location and design of the development.

A further representation had been received from the applicant's agent acknowledging that as yet there was no solution to the drainage problems, but that they were committed to solving the matter and would include the SUDS system as required. Revised proposals had been submitted to LCC Highways for consideration and it was requested that the decision be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer on resolution of the drainage issues.

Communication had since taken place with LCC Highways officers who were still unable to support the proposals, stating that the whole scheme needed to be reassessed.

Town Councillor Alan Caine then addressed the meeting and had circulated proposed additional reasons for refusal, and also a list of conditions to be applied should the Committee be minded to grant permission. Councillor Caine then described the proposed access on a bend, which with two new tourist sites gave potential for accidents, as it was believed there were several unreported incidents at that location. Reference was then made to the Area of High Landscape Value and Area of Natural Beauty. The density of 69 dwellings on the site was felt to be too many and that guidance recommended only 50 in such open areas. The name Waterhills signified the nature of the land with an underlying chalk watercourse, with biodiversity and rare wildlife habitats. There was the potential for the pollution of the watercourse and subsequent impact on the wildlife.

Louise Longstaff then spoke on behalf of the applicant, describing how work had been ongoing with officers for a number of years to achieve an acceptable proposal. The site would be complementary to Caistor in a sustainable location and was within 600m of the town centre as required by the Caistor Neighbourhood Plan. Few of the objections raised had any policy basis and apart from the drainage issues all aspects were considered acceptable. The land was in private ownership and had never been designated for public recreation. A contribution towards educational provision had been offered. The applicant was committed to addressing the drainage issues and requested that approval be delegated

to the Chief Operating Officer on resolution of the problems which were a minor technicality for which a resolution was possible.

Dan Morgan and Paul Stubbs then addressed the Committee as residents in objection to the proposals, stating whilst it was acknowledged that Caistor had to expand there were other more appropriate sites, on brownfield land and closer to facilities. Concerns were raised regarding highway safety, flooding and contamination of the chalk stream, the impact on already overstretched facilities such as the schools and health provision.

The Chairman verified with the Officer that the only reason for refusal was the drainage issues and that all other matters, such as highway safety were considered acceptable. The Principal Development Management Officer affirmed that the access had been considered by the LCC Highways department and was not a reason for refusal. Caistor was an appropriate focus for development, part of the site was allocated within the emerging Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and the site would contribute towards the Five Year Housing Land Supply. LCC had concerns with the flood risk and its impact on the site, nearby residents and wildlife, and were not convinced that the issues could be addressed.

Brief discussion ensued by the Committee, raising issues such as the time taken for determination, the density of the development, affordable housing and contributions towards education and health. It was clarified that there were no site allocations within the Caistor Neighbourhood Plan, but the site met policy criteria in terms of distance from the town centre. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan was now sufficiently advanced to be of primary weight in the consideration of applications.

It was suggested that a site visit take place in order to assess the site's position on the scarp slope, which would also give officers additional time to consider revised drainage plans.

It was therefore Moved, Seconded and **AGREED** that a site visit take place on a date to be determined.

33b 134622 - GAINSBOROUGH

Planning application for change of use of waste ground to car parking at Hickman Street, Gainsborough.

Note All Members of the Committee declared a non-pecuniary interest as the land was owned by West Lindsey District Council.

It was acknowledged that the proposal extended an existing car park and provided an additional 26 spaces, and also tidied an eyesore which needed addressing.

It was moved, seconded and voted upon, and subsequently **AGREED** that consent be **GRANTED**.

33c 134684 - GAINSBOROUGH

Planning application to construct two storey side extension including single storey porch

enclosure at front at 30 Heapham Road, Gainsborough.

It was verified that the applicant was an officer of the Council, hence the requirement for Committee determination. The application did not contravene any policies or design guidance, it was therefore moved, seconded and voted upon.

It was then **AGREED** to **GRANT** Conditional Planning Permission.

34 TREE PRESERVATION ORDER

Objection to Tree Preservation Order Ingham No1 2016

A tree application had been received to fell a large mature sycamore tree on land owned by the applicant at Ingham. The tree was situated close to the boundary with a residential property called Sycamore Lodge, and the reasons given for the tree removal were due to shading and virtually touching the house, and to avoid further complications.

On validating the application it was noted that the tree species on the application did not match the tree species in the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) document. It was realised that the original TPO document contained errors which could bring into question whether the tree was actually the one supposed to be protected by the TPO. It was decided that a new TPO needed to be made to ensure the tree was adequately protected, and avoid the protection of the TPO being questioned which could result in the tree being allowed to be felling in the event of an appeal.

Committee Members agreed that the tree added amenity value to the street scene.

On being moved, seconded and voted upon it was:

RESOLVED: the confirmation of the Tree Preservation Order Ingham No1 2016 be approved.

35 TO DETERMINE THE START TIME OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to express their views on the current start time of meetings of 6pm, as opposed to the previous regular time of 6.30pm.

Whilst the reason for the earlier start had been due to some long agendas, and since that time there had not been a large amount of applications, it was not possible to vary the commencement time of meetings according to the length of the agenda, this was affirmed by the legal officers present. A consistent start time had to be set to ensure that members of the public knew what time to expect the meeting to commence.

Members noted that it could be difficult for those that worked during the day, to get to the Guildhall for a 6pm start, plus free car parking in Marshall's Yard did not commence until 6pm. Sympathy was offered to those officers who had been at work for the whole day prior to the meeting, however it was generally felt that a 6.30pm start time was preferred.

It was moved, seconded and voted upon and **RESOLVED** that the normal commencement time of Planning Committee Meetings revert to the previous start time of 6.30pm.

36 TO NOTE THE DETERMINATION OF APPEALS

The Ward Member for the Tealby application expressed his disappointment at the outcome of the appeal.

RESOLVED: that the determination of appeals be noted.

The meeting concluded at 7.51 pm.

Chairman