

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the The Council Chamber - The Guildhall on 19 September 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 Roger Patterson
Councillor Thomas Smith

In Attendance:
George Backovic Principal Development Management Officer
Ian Elliott Senior Development Management Officer
Martha Rees Legal Advisor
Ele Durrant Democratic and Civic Officer

Also In Attendance: 2 members of the public

Apologies: Councillor Hugo Marfleet
Councillor Mrs Judy Rainsforth
Councillor Robert Waller

33 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

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

34 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 25 July 2018.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 25 July 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

35 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Fleetwood declared a non-pecuniary interest with relation to the planning application to be heard as agenda item 6a, in that he was Vice Chairman for the Parish Council which was objecting to the application. He clarified that he had not been involved

with any of the parish planning decisions and would be considering the application solely in his role as Chairman of the Committee.

36 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT/LOCAL CHANGES IN PLANNING POLICY

The Principal Development Management Officer advised Committee that there were no updates as such, but did explain that the Office of National Statistics were releasing their new household projections the day after the meeting and these would be used to assess housing needs.

37 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

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

37a 138157 - BLEAK FARM, CHERRY WILLINGHAM

The Chairman introduced the only application to be considered by Committee, application number 138157 seeking permission to erect 5no. detached dwellings on land adjacent to Bleak Farm High Street Cherry Willingham. 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 that, according to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 213, the local plan could be afforded full weight in the consideration of the application. With no further comment, the Chairman invited the registered speaker, Mr Howard Roe, to address Committee.

Mr Roe explained he was there to speak in favour of the application, as the applicant. He explained that the previous application for the site had been refused with the comment that the application was too generic. To this end he had resubmitted new drawings with more details of the proposed development. He explained that they had sufficient amounts of the original bricks from the site to build the facades of the two street facing, front houses which would maintain the look of the area. He also explained that he had brought brochures of other works with him in order to demonstrate to Members the look of the proposed dwellings. Mr Roe stated that most of what was built was constructed out of reclaimed materials and that they tried to build homes that did not look like they had all been built together. He explained to the Committee that they were a medium sized building firm that concentrated on building mainly out of reclaimed materials. He explained the site had been bought as it sat in an old part of the village and he wanted to build something that would be in-keeping with the village surroundings and that the community would be proud of. He advised Members that information had been sent to the parish clerk and he had offered to take parish councillors around the site however no one had been in contact or taken him up on his offer. He concluded by requesting permission to share the brochures he had brought as he felt these would help demonstrate the quality of what he was trying to achieve. The brochures were handed to the Principal Development Management Officer who confirmed they could be shared with Members. The brochures were then shared around the Committee.

The Senior Development Management Officer confirmed he had no further comment. The Chairman therefore invited comments from Committee. A Member of Committee commented that there had been representations from Ward Members and noted that there was no Ward Member present at Committee nor any parish council members. He stated that he could see no problem with the proposed development and felt the applicant was making sufficient effort to ensure the development would be beneficial to the village and fit in with the surroundings. He added that he had no issue with the application but would have liked to have heard from local members.

The Principal Development Management Officer clarified for Committee that the application had been referred for their decision as it had previously been agreed that any subsequent application would be heard by Committee. He highlighted that conditions could be added to give a steer to the applicant, for example in the use of preferred materials.

The Chairman also highlighted that there was an ongoing appeal regarding a previous application and that the main difference was in relation to the use of materials on the road side houses and also the modified heritage statement.

A Member of Committee commented that previously it had been intended to convert a barn on the site which had led to objections however the barn was no longer there and so those objections were no longer valid. He added that the use of reclaimed materials was a positive and, as the village homes were built from a variety of different bricks, the new builds would fit in to the surroundings. On the back of this, the Member stated he was happy to support the application and moved the proposal as detailed in the report.

The Chairman highlighted to Committee that a site being in a state of disrepair was not a suitable reason on which to base approval of planning permission. He acknowledged that the barns had been demolished but noted that the house could be restored. He commented that previous objections to other applications were still valid and that, as the farmyard was a good example of how a Lincolnshire farmyard used to be, it was important for the heritage of the site to be recognised. He noted that previous applications had proposed for some weight to be given to archaeological investigations although the current application stated that no additional weight should be given to it. The Chairman stated that he believed the site needed to be developed in a different way to that proposed in the application.

The divergent views regarding the archaeological consideration were also noted by another Member of Committee and it was questioned whether this was something that could be further explored. It was again commented that it was disappointing to not have representation from the parish council to provide their views. It was highlighted that there had been representation when the previous application was heard and the objections were considered to be the same.

There was significant discussion between Committee Members regarding the importance of the archaeological considerations and the proximity to listed buildings. It was highlighted by Officers that reasons for refusal of permission would need to be evidenced in particular the alleged impact on Listed Buildings. It was considered by the Vice-Chairman that further archaeological investigations were essential and he commented on the difference of recommendation for such investigations across the two applications. It was agreed that, should the Committee approve the application, there would need to be a condition added to

carry out the archaeological investigations. On further discussion, it was offered that on the basis that the current proposal did not resolve the original reasons for refusal of the previous application, the same arguments stood for refusal of the current application.

The Chairman clarified that the recommendation within the report, to grant permission subject to conditions, had been moved but not seconded and that there was now an alternative proposal to refuse planning permission given the numerous concerns raised for both the previous application and the current one.

Seeing no further speakers, the Chairman seconded the proposal to refuse and invited Committee to vote. With a minority vote for refusal, the proposal to refuse planning permission was not carried.

A Member of Committee then moved the recommendation to grant permission, with the added condition that an archaeological investigation must take place, which was seconded and opened to the vote. With four Members voting to approve the recommendation and four voting to not approve the recommendation, the Chairman's casting vote was used and the proposal to grant permission with the added condition was not carried.

The Legal Advisor highlighted to Committee that with the determination date approaching, there was a risk of non-determination and that any extension of that date would have to be agreed by the applicant.

There were significant discussions regarding the options available in the absence of a clear decision. It was explained that one option would be to refer the application to full Council, the other would be to defer the application for a later meeting. It was suggested that the application could be deferred to allow the submission of additional information to be sought from the applicant in relation to the exact materials to be used in the house builds and also whether some visual representation could be provided. It was also requested that further comment be sought regarding the need for an archaeological investigation. With this in mind, the proposal to defer the application to the next meeting was moved and seconded and put to the vote. It was therefore

RESOLVED that the application be deferred to the next meeting and additional information requested.

38 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS

The Chairman highlighted there were three appeal decisions on this occasion. A Member of Committee highlighted what appeared to be inconsistencies with the decisions of the Inspector. There were no other comments or questions from the Committee.

RESOLVED that the determination of appeals be noted.

The meeting concluded at 7.38 pm.

Chairman