

## 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 27 June 2018 commencing at 6.30 pm.

**Present:** Councillor Ian Fleetwood (Chairman)  
Councillor Owen Bierley (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Matthew Boles  
Councillor David Cotton  
Councillor Michael Devine  
Councillor Giles McNeill  
Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne  
Councillor Mrs Judy Rainsforth  
Councillor Thomas Smith  
Councillor Robert Waller

**In Attendance:**  
Martha Rees Legal Advisor  
Oliver Fytche-Taylor Planning & Development Manager  
Russell Clarkson Development Management Team Leader  
Martin Evans Senior Development Management Officer  
Ele Durrant Democratic and Civic Officer

**Apologies:** Councillor Hugo Marfleet  
Councillor Roger Patterson

**Also Present:** Councillor Jeff Summers, Ward Member, Waddingham and Spital  
Karen Whitfield, Communities & Commercial Programme Manager  
8 Members of the Public

### 17 CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME

The Chairman opened the meeting by welcoming all those present and any who may be watching the live webcast. He explained the procedure for the meeting and informed all present of the relevant housekeeping details.

### 18 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

There was no public participation at this point of the meeting.

## **19 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 30 May 2018.

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 30 May 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

## **20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors D. Cotton, J. Milne, M. Devine and J. Rainsforth declared they were members of the Crematorium Working Group, in relation to application 136962 (agenda item 6b).

Councillor J. Milne also declared that she was Ward Member for Lea (application number 136962, agenda item 6b) however she would be acting in her role as a member of the Planning Committee, not as Ward Member.

Councillor D. Cotton declared a pecuniary interest in relation to application number 136962, agenda item 6b, as both a member of the clergy and because the proposed crematorium would fall within his ecclesiastical parish. He explained he had been recommended to leave the room for the duration of the item.

**Note:** Prior to Committee the Monitoring Officer granted the dispensation allowing Members to hear and vote on agenda item 6b (application number 136962).

## **21 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT/LOCAL CHANGES IN PLANNING POLICY**

The Planning and Development Manager advised Committee there were no local or national updates to be shared.

## **22 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION**

**RESOLVED** that the applications detailed in agenda item 6 be dealt with as follows:-

### **23 137443 MOAT FARM**

The Chairman introduced the first of the applications to be considered by Committee, application number 137443 for change of use from agricultural steel portal shed to ACU accredited flat track training school with associated parking, landscaping and portakabin/office (resubmission of 136025). The Chairman stated there was one speaker registered. He explained the process for hearing the application and invited the Senior Development Management Officer to present the item to Committee.

The Senior Development Management Officer advised Committee there were no further updates or additional information to the report and so the Chairman invited the registered speaker, Councillor Jeff Summers, to address Committee.

Councillor Summers explained that he was there to speak in favour of the application in his role as Ward Member for Waddingham and Spital. He noted that the application had previously been refused because of concerns about noise levels and he highlighted that the applicant had made the necessary changes to reduce noise levels. He also explained that the applicant had undertaken to make further changes should the application be agreed, such as moving the entrance door to open into open field space. Councillor Summers stated that this was the only facility for flat track training and that people came from all over the country to use it. He explained to Committee that he had visited the site with a device to measure noise levels and gave a run through of different sounds that had registered on the device. As examples he gave the noise of a nearby lawnmower, farm animals on the site, agricultural work that was going on and detailed the distances from the training track at which he had taken his readings. Full details of his findings were included in his representation for the Officer's report. To conclude, Councillor Summers highlighted that any noise generated by the training track was negligible in relation to other sounds in the area and he strongly recommended that the application be approved.

The Senior Development Management Officer clarified for Committee that although Councillor Summers had included his sound readings in his representation of support, Officers were duty bound to base their recommendations on the figures provided by the official noise assessment and the related comments of the Council's Environmental Protection Team as the appropriate consultee regarding noise matters.

With no further comment from Officers, the Chairman invited comments from Committee. One Member of Committee enquired as to the impact of having to keep windows and doors closed whilst the track was in use and whether this would pose problems in terms of a concentration of exhaust fumes within the building. The Senior Development Management Officer confirmed this had not been considered to pose a risk and there had been no concerns raised about it. Another Committee Member noted that those raising objections were not only concerned about noise levels and that there were several incidents of track users driving up private driveways. She also enquired as to the specifics of the sound proofing to be used and whether there was any direct guidance on what should be used. The Senior Development Management Officer confirmed that condition one provided control over the precise sound mitigation and detailed a section in the report where the sound assessment had made specific recommendations for "solid cladding, the closing of gaps in the structure, doors being kept closed when motorcycle training is in progress, restricted training hours of 9am-9pm, the type of motorbike being restricted to a static noise level of 98dBAS and configuring any necessary ventilation outlet to the south aspect".

There were no further questions or comments and it was therefore moved, seconded and voted upon that permission be **GRANTED** in accordance with the conditions as set out in the report.

## **24 136962 LEA CREMATORIUM**

**Note:** Councillor D. Cotton retired from the room at 18:48.

The Chairman introduced application 136962 for a single cremator and chapel crematorium building with memorial facility, to include car parking facilities and related hard-landscaped areas as well as formal and informal landscaped gardens. The Development Management

Team Leader advised Committee there were no other updates to the report and so the Chairman invited the first speaker, Karen Whitfield – Communities and Commercial Programme Manager, to address Committee.

The Communities and Commercial Programme Manager explained she was speaking in support of the application and highlighted that there was not currently a crematorium facility in West Lindsey. She explained to Committee that residents of West Lindsey had to travel significant distances, at what was already a very difficult time, and often had to wait several weeks for a cremation slot. She highlighted that space for burial grounds was decreasing both within the District and nationally; the amount of housing growth planned for the District and the ageing population with the District; and that currently 75% of funerals resulted in cremation. She explained that the Council had been mindful to ensure the development of the project and the planning aspects had been kept separate and independent, to this end, independent planning consultants had been employed to ensure a robust process was followed. She stated that the site for the proposed development had undergone a comprehensive site selection process to incorporate the requirements presented in the Crematoria Act 1902. Out of all sites considered, this location was deemed to be the optimum site identified. The Communities and Commercial Programme Manager gave further details as to the details of the development, such as the design to be in keeping with the area and for landscaping and additional planting to provide tranquillity and areas for quiet reflection.

The Communities and Commercial Programme Manager explained that there had been significant feedback to support the proposed development, not least from local funeral directors, celebrants and clergy who had welcomed the proposals and highlighted the need for such a site locally. It was explained that there was the additional provision to accommodate bariatric coffins which would negate the current requirement to travel to Peterborough. It was acknowledged that there were concerns amongst local residents, mainly in relation to traffic issues and risk of pollution. It was explained that a full traffic impact assessment had been carried out and considered by the local Highways Authority and the result of the assessment was that the development was not anticipated to cause a significant impact on the local highway or its operation. Additionally, it was highlighted that the entrance to the crematorium from the highway had been designed in such a way to allow vehicles to facilitate quick and safe turning. In view of local concerns about pollution, it was explained to Committee that as a new facility the proposed crematorium development would be fitted with mercury abatement and would comply with all current regulations, furthermore, the Environment Agency had raised no concerns regarding the plans.

The Communities and Commercial Programme Manager concluded by highlighting the additional benefits to the local economy, aside from providing a much needed service, such as new employment opportunities and value added, and thanked Committee for their time.

The Chairman thanked the first speaker and invited the following two speakers to step up to the microphone. He explained they had a total of 5 minutes to address Committee and that how the time was divided between them was at their discretion.

The first person to speak, Councillor David Belton, explained he and the next speaker, Councillor Anthony Mophet, were representing Knaith Parish Council, in opposition to the proposed development. He stated that the finances and estimated numbers of cremations at the proposed new site were unclear and he would like to know how the estimated cost of

£6million would be paid back. He questioned the payback period of six years and felt the proposals had been presented with unclear financial details. Councillor Belton noted to Committee that the Parish Council disagreed that the site was the best option. He stated that more suitable siting could have been found for the development and this might have been identified had the rest of the proposed sites been more suitable. He felt that some of the alternative sites were 'not funny' in their unsuitability for the proposed crematorium. He concluded his comments with a quote from the website and handed over to his colleague, Councillor Anthony Morphet.

Councillor Morphet suggested to Committee that the facts and figures included in the application had not been accurate and that, as an example, by working out the number of cremations needed to meet the predicted profit margin, there was likely to be twice the amount of traffic than what had been presented to the Highways Agency. He felt this meant the Highways Agency had not been provided with sufficient details to accurately assess the impact on local traffic. He further highlighted that the funeral corteges would be travelling significantly slower than the 60mph speed limit and that this in itself would create problems. Councillor Morphet noted that there was no proposal put forward for traffic management as part of the application. With regard to the facts and figures presented for projected services at the crematorium, he queried how this could be accurate when there were two new crematoria being built in the area which would have an impact on the number of services likely to take place at the proposed Lea site. He again highlighted that he felt the report had been based on incorrect projections and as such was not a realistic business model.

At the conclusion of his speech, the Chairman thanked both Councillors and asked Committee to note that the objectors had been afforded six and a half minutes to speak, in contrast to the five minutes usually permitted. He felt this had allowed them fair chance to express their views however, several of the issues raised had not been of a planning nature and therefore would not be taken into consideration by Committee. He invited the Development Management Team Leader to respond to any points raised and it was reiterated that it was not in the remit of the Committee to look at the finances of the proposal. The Development Management Team Leader explained that the estimated traffic had been based on seven services per day, with the maximum attendance of 120 guests and only two guests per car (ie, 60 cars per service). This was considered to be the 'worst case scenario' and the Highways Agency found it to be acceptable. It was clarified that there had been no concerns raised regarding traffic movements and the likely reduced speed of corteges, it was accepted that it would be open to the Local Highways Authority to reduce the speed limit if they found it necessary to do so.

The Chairman invited comments from Committee Members and it was noted by a member of the Crematorium Working Group that, based on a visit they had made to another crematorium, their personal concerns about how it would work had been alleviated. It was explained to Committee that other crematoria in the area were at the point of reaching capacity and therefore any concerns about level of use and numbers of services were unfounded. It was highlighted that it was important to consider what was important for the district.

Another Member of Committee enquired whether there were any plans to link in with public transport providers as the nearest bus stop was a short walk away from the entrance. It was agreed that as the crematorium would not be opening until a point in the future, the County Council could liaise with bus companies if they felt it necessary. It was also noted that the

expectation was that most attendance would be via private vehicles.

There was further discussion regarding predicted numbers of mourners attending services and it was acknowledged that some services would have high numbers of attendees where others may be less well attended. It was also noted that there was no reason to doubt the facts and figures put forward by the official report.

There were no further questions or comments and it was therefore moved, seconded and voted upon with unanimous agreement that permission be **GRANTED** in accordance with the conditions as set out in the report.

## **25 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS**

**Note:** Councillor D. Cotton returned at 19:18.

The Chairman highlighted there were four appeal decisions on this occasion. There were no comments or questions from the Committee.

**RESOLVED** that the determination of appeals be noted.

The meeting concluded at 7.19 pm.

Chairman