

## WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held Virtual - MS Teams on 6 January 2021 commencing at 6.30 pm.

**Present:** Councillor Ian Fleetwood (Chairman)  
Councillor Robert Waller (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Owen Bierley  
Councillor Matthew Boles  
Councillor David Cotton  
Councillor Michael Devine  
Councillor Jane Ellis  
Councillor Mrs Cordelia McCartney  
Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne  
Councillor Keith Panter  
Councillor Roger Patterson  
Councillor Mrs Judy Rainsforth  
Councillor Mrs Angela White

**In Attendance:**  
Rachel Woollass Development Management Team Leader  
Daniel Evans Senior Development Management Officer  
Danielle Peck Development Management Officer  
Martha Rees Legal Advisor  
Ele Snow Democratic and Civic Officer  
James Welbourn Democratic and Civic Officer

**Apologies:** Councillor Cherie Hill

### 83 REGISTER OF ATTENDANCE

The Chairman undertook the register of attendance for Members and each Councillor confirmed their attendance individually.

The Democratic Services Officer completed the register of attendance for Officers and, as with Members, each Officer confirmed their attendance individually.

### 84 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

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

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

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 9 December 2020 be confirmed as an accurate record.

## **86 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor J. Milne declared a personal interest in application number 141017 in that the application site was close to where she lived and she knew others in the area.

Councillor M. Devine also declared a personal interest in application number 141017 that he knew the applicant personally and the Union branch with which he was involved had donated money for benches in the park. He declared he had spoken with the applicant about the process at Planning Committee, in terms of how it worked but not in an advisory capacity.

Councillor M. Boles declared a personal interest for application number 141017 as he knew the application and had previously supported another of the applicant's business through Lincolnshire County Council but was not connected with this application.

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

The Committee heard from the Development Management Team Leader regarding updates and changes in planning policy. She stated that the Government currently had a consultation seeking the views on permitted development rights, changes of use and speeding up planning permission for public service infrastructure. The consultation would close on 28 January 2021 and a response was being prepared for agreement by the Prosperous Communities Committee.

With regard to Neighbourhood Planning, the Committee heard that the examinations for the Scotton Neighbourhood Plan and the Bishop Norton Neighbourhood Plan were successful and decision statements had been issued. The referendums were due to be held 6 May 2021.

The examination of the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan was complete and the examiner's draft final report had been issued for fact checking purposes only. Assuming the examination was successful, the referendum would be held on 6 May 2021.

The examination process had started for the Morton Neighbourhood Plan and was at the stage of appointing the examiner. Assuming the examination was successful, the referendum would be held on 6 May 2021.

Consultation on the Draft Corringham Neighbourhood Plan would end on 8 January 2021; the plan carried some weight. The consultation on the Draft Sturton and Stow Neighbourhood Plan was completed on 14 December 2020 and carried some weight. Finally, consultation on the site assessment report for the Ingham Neighbourhood Plan was completed on 11 December 2020.

## **88 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION**

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

### **89 141017 - "LAND AT", NORTH STREET AND SPITAL TERRACE, GAINSBOROUGH**

The Chairman introduced application number 141017, for change of use of land to park including siting of vehicle for hot & cold foods, seating, raised area, perimeter fencing, and siting of a storage shed. The Planning Officer stated to Members that there had been an additional public consultation response received. It was a supportive comment, describing the site as a great addition to the town and an amazing transformation by a local organisation.

The Chairman noted there was one registered speaker, by way of a statement to be read by the Democratic and Civic Officer. The following statement from Mr Steve Ralf, the applicant, was read aloud.

"I would like to say that we are delighted to have transformed this long standing piece of waste land into a community park, in the heart of town, that Gainsborough can be proud of. As custodians of the site and a charitable community organisation we have no desire to upset other local businesses or residents and many have been involved in the development of the park including attending test events and activities. We look forward to offering a wonderful green space and a range of family activity and events for all."

The Chairman invited comments from Members of the Committee. There was discussion regarding the merits of the concept however concerns were raised in relation to comments made by the Environmental Health Officers stating the need for customer toilets, whether licences would be needed for food, drink and evening events. It was also highlighted that comments from the Highways Agency were not conclusive nor was it clear whether there was an issue with the site in relation to nearby heritage buildings. A Member of Committee agreed with these comments and, based on concerns that the proposal was not in keeping with the area, proposed refusal of the application.

The Planning Officer noted that concerns regarding food hygiene, licences and provision of customer toilets were not covered by planning legislation and highlighted that the recommendation was to grant the principle of development, subject to deferral back to Officers for resolution of outstanding matters in relation to odour. With regard to concerns of evening events, he highlighted the proposed condition that stated no live event would take place from the site. He also commented that, in relation to concerns of the impact on nearby heritage buildings, the NPPF advised that where the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. He commented that the improvement to the public realm was to be weighed against the harm caused by the structures on site and, in this instance, the benefits to the public realm outweighed the harm identified.

A Member of Committee enquired about how the odour reports had been conducted and it was confirmed that Environmental Health had requested the odour report and what had been submitted was based on informal assessment by people who had used the site and

their judgement as to the impact of any odour. There had been no professional testing and the Environmental Health team had suggested there to be further work undertaken using professional equipment.

There was further discussion regarding the impact of the site on the conservation area, and, whilst this was recognised to be important, it was highlighted that the original plan for the site had been to build flats and there had very recently been a new hotel built on the opposite side of the road. It was suggested that the improvement to the site that had taken place was preferable and less obstructive to the conservation area than other developments. In contrast to this, further concerns were raised regarding the mention of live events to be held on the site and the Member proposal to refuse permission was seconded.

The Chairman invited any other comments from Committee Members. Members reiterated previously stated supportive comments regarding the application and the Officer recommendation was moved and seconded.

With no further comments from Members, the Chairman took the vote for the Officer recommendation to grant permission subject to further odour testing. With six votes against, five votes for and two abstentions, the vote was lost.

The Chairman then took the vote on the second proposal, to refuse permission. With five votes against, six votes for and two abstentions, it was agreed that permission be **REFUSED** as contrary to LP25, LP26, LP38 and NPP 18.

## **90 142050, 81 SUNNINGDALE WAY, GAINSBOROUGH**

The Chairman introduced the second application of the evening, number 142050, to remove existing single storey garage and replace with two storey side extension. The Planning Officer advised there had been a further three consultation responses received, none of which raised any objections. She reiterated to Members that the recommendation was to delegate the decision to Officers at the close of the consultation period.

With no speakers registered and no Committee Members indication to speak, the Chairman highlighted that the application was being presented to the Committee as the applicant was a family member of a Council Officer. Had that not been the case, the application would have been decided under delegated authority.

Having been moved, seconded and taken to the vote, it was unanimously **AGREED** that the decision be delegated to the Planning Officer to grant permission, subject to conditions.

## **91 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS**

The determination of appeals was **NOTED**.

The meeting concluded at 7.22 pm.

Chairman