

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall on 1 December 2021 commencing at 6.30 pm.

Present: Councillor Ian Fleetwood (Chairman)

Councillor Matthew Boles
Councillor David Cotton
Councillor Michael Devine
Councillor Jane Ellis
Councillor Cherie Hill
Councillor Mrs Cordelia McCartney
Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne
Councillor Mrs Judy Rainsforth
Councillor Mrs Angela White

In Attendance:

Russell Clarkson	Interim Planning Manager (Development Management)
Rachel Woollass	Development Management Team Leader
Ian Elliott	Senior Development Management Officer
Richard Green	Planning Officer
Vicky Maplethorpe	Area Development Officer
Martha Rees	Legal Advisor
Ele Snow	Senior Democratic and Civic Officer

Apologies: Councillor Robert Waller
Councillor Roger Patterson

65 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

The Chairman stated there was one registered speaker under the Public Participation scheme, Councillor Robin Darby of the Bardney Group Parish Council. He explained that, given current uncertainties regarding the spread of the new strain of covid-19, Councillor Darby had submitted a statement to be read aloud on his behalf. The following statement was duly read aloud by the Democratic Services Officer:

“At the Planning Committee in December 2020, comments were made with regards to the actions of Bardney Group Parish Council and in particular an allegation in relation to lobbying. At no time during the proceedings did anyone from this Committee correct the speaker. These allegations were made in front of our residents and has done reputational damage to my council. In January, Bardney Group Parish Council, wrote to West Lindsey District Council, highlighting the error by this committee and asking for a formal apology.

At the February 2021 Planning Committee meeting Cllr Cotton apologised to this committee for his misleading comments, however this did not extend to Bardney Group Parish Council.

In May 2021, I sat before this committee and outlined the fact that Bardney Group Parish Council had still not received an apology, to which the response from the Chairman was to say, that due to the fact that he had not received prior notice of my question, a response could not be offered.

I did make a request to speak again on this issue at the September Planning Committee meeting, however due to an administration error this did not happen.

Therefore, one year on from the event, Bardney Group Parish Council would like to receive a formal public, and fully minuted, apology from this council for misleading members of the public and causing reputational damage through comments and allegations that were made by the West Lindsey District Council Planning Committee at the December 2020 meeting.”

The Chairman acknowledged the statement and explained that the matter would be raised with the Monitoring Officer for response. Councillor D. Cotton raised a Point of Information regarding previous correspondence on this matter, the Chairman reiterated for the statement to be referred to the Monitoring Officer.

66 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 3 November 2021 be confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

67 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor C. Hill declared that she was the Ward Member for Cherry Willingham ward, in relation to application number 143301 (agenda item 6d) however she had had no prior communication and would deal with it as a member of the Planning Committee.

Councillor I. Fleetwood, for transparency, declared he was County Councillor for Bardney and Cherry Willingham (in relation to application number 143301, agenda item 6d) however would remain in the Chair for that item.

68 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT/LOCAL CHANGES IN PLANNING POLICY

Members heard that there were no policy updates to note however the following summary of Neighbourhood Plans was provided.

Neighbourhood Plan/s	Headlines	Planning Decision Weighting
Made Neighbourhood Plans	Brattleby, Caistor*, Cherry Willingham, Dunholme, Great Limber, Lea, Nettleham*, Osgodby, Riseholme, Scotter, Scothern, Saxilby, Welton, Willoughton, Glentworth, Spridlington, Sudbrooke, Scotton, Bishop Norton and Atterby, Gainsborough, and Morton.	Full weight

Corringham NP	Examination successful. A decision statement has been issued confirming that NP should be given significant weight in planning decisions and that the referendum is to be held this week on Thursday 2 December.	Significant weight
Sturton by Stow and Stow joint NP	Consultation on the submission version of NP (Reg16) has closed . Responses to consultation posted on WLDC website. Examination process has begun with the appointment of an examiner.	Increasing weight
Hemswell Cliff NP	Submission version to be issued (Reg16) soon.	Some weight
Hemswell and Harpswell joint NP	Submission version received. Consultation (Reg16) to commence shortly.	Some weight
Keelby NP	Expect to receive pre-submission version in near future for our comments (Reg 14).	Little weight
Grasby NP	Preparation now underway. Leaflet drop to residents to take place also to seek volunteers to help with the NP.	Little weight
Caistor NP Review*	Consultation starts early in New Year with workshops and other community engagement events.	Little weight
Neighbourhood Plans - made (21) - in preparation (20) - in pipeline (42) - being reviewed (2)*	To view all of WLDC's neighbourhood plans go to: https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building/neighbourhood-planning/	NP stage-weighting -Made–full weight -Referendum successful–full weight -Examination successful/Decision Statement issued–significant weight -Submission Reg16–increasing weight -Draft Reg14 - some weight -Designated – little weight

69 142221 LITTLE LONDON FARM NORTH KELSEY

The Chairman introduced the first application of the evening, planning application number 142221, outline planning permission for three dwellings including demolition of existing commercial buildings - all matters reserved, on land adjacent to Little London Farm, Little London, North Kelsey, Market Rasen.

With no updates from the Planning Officer, the Chairman invited the registered speaker, Leanne Pogson, Agent for the Applicant, to address the Committee. The Agent made the following statement:

“Thank you and good evening. My name is Leanne Pogson and I'm the agent representing

the applicants who are the executors of the estate of Mrs. Audrey Balderson. This application seeks outline permission for three dwellings including demolition of existing commercial buildings and has been recommended for approval by the case officer.

The site is located in a built footprint of North Kelsey and comprises of two frame buildings which are in a poor state of repair, an area of hardstanding is around that building also. There are traditional brick buildings to the west which are the subject of an application for conversion to a dwelling which will be considered by this committee after this application.

Access to the site will be by the existing vehicle access which also serves two residential dwellings to the south of application site. This access leads onto Cemetery Lane. As stated in the officer's report North Kelsey has a growth level of up to 10% and will still support 13 new dwellings before this growth limit is met. The site is within the built footprint of the settlement, is a brownfield site and is therefore within the first category of land to be developed on the land availability sequential test in policy LP4. There are no technical objections to the application, with highways, drainage, ecology and environmental health comments all being considered to be acceptable, subject to appropriate conditions. Any concerns regarding design and amenity can be designed out at reserved matter stage.

Various objections have been received in relation to the application which relates to job losses and employment. I can confirm that following the death of the owner of the site, the sole tenant of the site was given notice to leave. Notice was served on the 19th of August 2020, which confirmed the tenancy would end on the 22nd of February 2021. The notice was served before the planning applications were submitted with the hope that the planning applications would be determined soon after the site became vacant. The tenancy was extended until June 2021, due to the tenant having an operation. The site was vacated at the end of June and still remains vacant. As notice to vacate the site was given an advance of the application being submitted, and the site being vacant, there are no jobs to be lost by the proposal. The officer's report goes into more details regarding planning history and the businesses which have been advertised on the site.

As outlined in the officer's report, the site would have potential to be used for unrestricted general industrial purposes without the need for further planning application. This has caused potential serious adverse impacts on a residential manatee of neighbouring properties and on Cemetery Lane. A unilateral undertaking has been signed, which would prevent any commercial operations taking place once development commences to ensure that there will not be any mix of residential and industrial development on the site, which prevent any future industrial development unless new permission was granted.

The NPPF states there is a favour in presumption of sustainable development unless material considerations indicate otherwise. A proposed development of three dwellings is considered by the case officer in line with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, and the NPPF, to be sustainable. The absence of any concerns and objections by technical consultees, subject to conditions, the confirmation that we know job losses as a result of the development and the presence of a legal agreement would demonstrate that there are no material considerations which would justify refusing the application.

As such on behalf of my client, I respectfully ask Members to follow officer recommendation, local and national planning policy, and grant permission for this proposal. Thank you.”

The Chairman thanked the speaker and with no further comments from the Officer, invited discussion from Members.

A Member of the Committee enquired as to whether there was asbestos sheeting in the existing buildings, to which it was explained that if there was, there was legislation as to how it would need to be dealt with. It was also confirmed that, as a reserved matters application, future applications could be seen by the Committee where necessary. Following a question from a Member, it was confirmed there were no ongoing farm activities.

Having been proposed and seconded, the Chairman took the vote and it was unanimously agreed that permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

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

1. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To conform with Section 92 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. No development shall take place until, plans and particulars of the access, appearance, layout and scale of the buildings to be erected and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called “the reserved matters”) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with those details.

Reason: The application is in outline only and the Local Planning Authority wishes to ensure that these details which have not yet been submitted are appropriate for the locality.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years from the date of final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: To conform with Section 92 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

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

4. No development shall take place until, suitably qualified contaminated land assessments and associated remedial strategy with none technical summaries, conclusions and recommendations, together with a timetable of works, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and the measures approved in that scheme shall be fully implemented. [Outcomes shall appropriately reflect end use and when combining another investigative purpose have a dedicated contaminative summary with justifications cross referenced]. The scheme shall include all of the following measures unless the LPA dispenses with any such requirement specifically in writing:

a) The contaminated land assessment shall include a desk study to be submitted to the LPA for approval. The desk study shall detail the history of the site uses and propose a site investigation strategy based on the relevant information discovered by the desk study. The

strategy shall be approved by the LPA prior to investigations commencing on site.

b) The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling, shall be carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a Quality Assured sampling and analysis methodology.

c) A site investigation report detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of analysis, risk assessment to any receptors and a proposed remediation strategy shall be submitted to the LPA. The LPA shall approve such remedial works as required prior to any remediation commencing on site. The works shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end-use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters.

d) Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance. If during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the LPA.

e) Upon completion of the works, this condition shall not be discharged until a closure report has been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The closure report shall include details of the proposed remediation works and quality assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full in accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included in the closure report together with the necessary documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from the site.

Reason: In order to safeguard human health and the water environment and identify potential contamination on-site and the potential for off-site migration as recommended by the Environment Agency and the Housing and Environmental Enforcement Manager in accordance with the NPPF and Policy LP16 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

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

5. No development other than to foundations shall take place until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters (including the results of soakaway/percolation tests) 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 scheme and be available for use before the first occupation of the dwellings.

Reason: To ensure adequate drainage facilities are provided to serve the development in accordance with Policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

6. New hardstanding shall be constructed from a porous material or shall be appropriately drained within the site and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate drainage to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

7. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the recommendations contained within the Ecological Appraisal (CGC Ecology August 2020) and within the Bat Survey (CGC Ecology October 2020).

Reason: To safeguard wildlife in the interests of nature conservation in accordance with

National Planning Policy Framework and Policy LP21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

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

8. Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, AA, B, C, D, and E of Schedule 2 Part 1 and Class A of Schedule 2 Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) Order 2015, or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order, the building hereby permitted shall not be altered or extended, no new windows shall be inserted, and no buildings or structures shall be erected within the curtilage of the host dwelling, no new hardstanding and gates, walls or fences unless planning permission has first been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable any such proposals to be assessed in terms of their impact on the living conditions of the host and neighbouring dwellings and the resulting amount of space around the host dwelling and to safeguard the character of its surroundings in accordance with Policies LP17 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

70 142247 LITTLE LONDON FARM NORTH KELSEY

The Chairman introduced the next application, number 142247, application for conversion of barns to 1no. dwelling at Little London Farm, Little London, North Kelsey, Market Rasen. There were no updates and the Officer presented details of the application to the Committee.

The Chairman confirmed there was one registered speaker and invited Leanne Pogson, Agent, to return to the Chamber to address the Committee. The following statement was made.

“As has been said this application is associated with a previous application and seeks for planning permission for the conversion of barns to a single dwelling. Again the site is located in built footprint of North Kelsey and comprise additional one and two storey pantile barns and of the more recent additions in the form of steel port and fibre sheet roof buildings, which will be removed as part of the proposal. The barns will be converted to a single dwelling with a single storey barn converted to a bedroom, the two storey barns are a full height living area. A garden courtyard will be created to the south with a rear garden area to the north. The buildings are considered to be non designated heritage assets and worthy of retention and renovation. The proposed conversions are sympathetic to historic buildings and appropriate materials will be used in the renovations.

Conversion of the barns to residential, will ensure the retention and enhancement of these traditional buildings to preserve and enhance the character of the area. Discussions were held with a Conservation Officer by the case officer to ensure that the most appropriate design was achieved to preserve this building. Leaving the building vacant would likely result in falling into disrepair and it would not be economically viable to renovate the building for commercial purposes, meaning conversion would be the most appropriate use.

Careful consideration has been given to the conversions by removing out of character additions and renovating the barns to replicate the original buildings as far as possible. The

barn is far enough away from existing dwellings, over 20 metres at the closest point, as not to cause any loss of privacy, overlooking or the loss of amenity to neighbouring properties. As per the previous application, the access to the site will be via the existing vehicle access off Cemetery Lane. Matters related to sustainability, employment and alternative uses are all the same for the previous application. And again, there are no technical objections which cannot be overcome by conditions. Thank you.”

The Chairman thanked the speaker and opened for comments from the Committee.

A Member of the Committee raised concerns regarding how it was intended to deal with sewage and drainage water. The Officer explained condition 10 addressed these concerns.

With no comments from Members, and having been proposed and seconded, on voting it was agreed that permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following 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 works shall take place until a full historic building recording (see notes to applicants below) of the barns (interior and exterior) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the preparation and implementation of an appropriate scheme of archaeological mitigation and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. No development shall take place until, suitably qualified contaminated land assessments and associated remedial strategy with none technical summaries, conclusions and recommendations, together with a timetable of works, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and the measures approved in that scheme shall be fully implemented. [Outcomes shall appropriately reflect end use and when combining another investigative purpose have a dedicated contaminative summary with justifications cross referenced]. The scheme shall include all of the following measures unless the LPA dispenses with any such requirement specifically in writing:

a) The contaminated land assessment shall include a desk study to be submitted to the LPA for approval. The desk study shall detail the history of the site uses and propose a site investigation strategy based on the relevant information discovered by the desk study. The strategy shall be approved by the LPA prior to investigations commencing on site.

b) The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling, shall be carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a Quality Assured sampling and analysis methodology.

c) A site investigation report detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of analysis, risk assessment to any receptors and a proposed remediation

strategy shall be submitted to the LPA. The LPA shall approve such remedial works as required prior to any remediation commencing on site. The works shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end-use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters.

d) Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance. If during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the LPA.

e) Upon completion of the works, this condition shall not be discharged until a closure report has been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The closure report shall include details of the proposed remediation works and quality assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full in accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included in the closure report together with the necessary documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from the site.

Reason: In order to safeguard human health and the water environment and identify potential contamination on-site and the potential for off-site migration as recommended by the Environment Agency and the Housing and Environmental Enforcement Manager in accordance with the NPPF and Policy LP16 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

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

4. 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: 028542.04B dated 20/05/2021, 028542.05D dated 20/05/2021, 028542.06A dated 20/05/2021 and 028542.02A dated 20/08/2021. 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 in the interests of proper planning.

5. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the recommendations contained within the Ecological Appraisal (CGC Ecology August 2020) and within the Bat Survey (CGC Ecology October 2020).

Reason: To safeguard wildlife in the interests of nature conservation in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework and Policy LP21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

6. No development, other than to foundations level shall take place until the proposed new walling, roofing, windows, doors and other external materials 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. The details submitted shall include; the proposed colour finish, rainwater goods and type of pointing to be used.

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate materials to safeguard the character and appearance of this non-designated heritage asset in accordance with the NPPF and Policies LP25 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

7. No development, other than to foundations level shall take place until details of all new external timber windows and doors at a scale of no less than 1:20 and glazing bars at scale of 1:1 to include method of opening, cills, headers and lintels, colour and finish are submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate materials to safeguard the character and appearance of this non-designated heritage asset in accordance with the NPPF and Policies LP25 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

8. No development, other than to foundations level shall take place until a 1m square sample panel of the proposed new brickwork, showing the coursing of the brickwork, colour, style and texture of the mortar and bond of the brickwork have been provided on site for the inspection and approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority (the sample is to be retained on site until the new development is completed). The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details (see notes to the applicant below).

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate materials to safeguard the character and appearance of this non-designated heritage asset in accordance with the NPPF and Policies LP25 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

9. Notwithstanding the drawings supplied (Drawing No. 028542.04B dated 20/05/2021 and 028542.05D dated 20/05/2021) no development other than to foundations level, shall take place until full details of the proposed glazed screens on the east elevation of the bedroom range are approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details and be complete before the dwelling is first occupied.

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate materials to safeguard the character and appearance of this non-designated heritage asset in accordance with the NPPF and Policies LP25 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

10. No development, other than to foundations level shall take place until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters (including the results of soakaway/percolation tests) 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 and prior to occupation of the dwelling.

Reason: To ensure adequate drainage facilities are provided to serve the development in accordance with Policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

11. New hardstanding shall be constructed from a porous material or shall be appropriately drained within the site and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate drainage to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

12. No development, other than to foundations level shall take place until, a scheme of landscaping including details of the size, species and position or density of any trees and

hedging to be planted and boundary treatments (including boundaries within the site) and hardstanding 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.

Reason: To ensure the site is visually softened by appropriate methods and to enable any such proposals to be assessed in terms of their impact on the Conservation Area/Listed Buildings in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies LP17, LP26 and LP25 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

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

13. All planting and turfing approved in the scheme of landscaping under condition 12 shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or hedging 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. The landscaping should be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the site is visually softened by appropriate methods and to enable any such proposals to be assessed in terms of their impact on this non designated heritage asset in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies LP17, LP26 and LP25 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

14. Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, AA, B, C, D, and E of Schedule 2 Part 1 and Class A of Schedule 2 Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) Order 2015, or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order, the building hereby permitted shall not be altered or extended, no new windows shall be inserted, and no buildings or structures shall be erected within the curtilage of the host dwelling, no new hardstanding and gates, walls or fences unless planning permission has first been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable any such proposals to be assessed in terms of their impact on the living conditions of the host and neighbouring dwellings and the resulting amount of space around the host dwelling and to safeguard the character and appearance of the building and its surroundings in accordance with Policies LP17, LP25 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

71 143410 LAND NORTH OF NORMANBY RISE CLAXBY

The next application was introduced, application number 143410 for 4no. semi-detached dwellings on land north of Normanby Rise, Claxby, Market Rasen. The Committee heard there had been three further representations received and these were summarised as follows.

“LCC Highways: My preference would be for them to look at providing 2 spaces per dwelling. Thanks

Local Resident: Wold Haven Normanby Rise Claxby: Despite a few cosmetic changes and moving forward of these houses, the fundamental problems of building density, parking and suitability for an AONB have not been addressed.

Reducing the development to two (perhaps detached) properties would be a far better solution.

Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Service Manager: I have reviewed the revised plans for the four properties. I note that this is largely a return to the original submission for the site, so our concerns remain in terms of the localised impact upon the character of the nationally protected Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

We continue to support the views of Claxby Parish Council, that the plot is too small to accommodate the proposed four residential properties and that these do not link to the existing character of adjacent properties in Normanby Road.

The difficulties in the density of the dwellings proposed for the site is further evidenced by the County Council Highway's response and its recommendation of the need for two car parking spaces per property - so a minimum of eight bays in total would be required, before allowing for any additional capacity for visitor parking.

As indicated by other respondents, I'm assuming that the previous planning application for four properties (planning ref: 98/P/0066) as detailed in the applicant's submission, was for a much larger plot and is effectively now null and void and predates the current planning policies and guidance as covered within the Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework."

The Chairman stated there were three registered speakers and invited the first, the representative of Claxby Parish Council, to address the Committee. Mr David Beer made the following statement.

"Thank you Chairman and Members of the Committee. I am representing Claxby Parish Council. The parish council has already objected to the proposal for four houses on this small site, on the grounds that it's an overdevelopment of the site in a rural village in an area of outstanding natural beauty.

Following the objection, the plans were then altered to remove one half of the proposed development, leaving the other half of the site open for future development. After objections to the second proposal, this further alteration to the application reverts to what is essentially the same design of four semi detached houses, albeit slightly smaller, and the parish council objects again on the same basis. It's an overdevelopment of a small site in a small village in an AONB. It will put a strain on the infrastructure, The sewage treatment plant is already at capacity. With a potential of at least two cars per household it would also have a huge impact on traffic on Normanby Rise, which is already a busy thoroughfare. There'd be great difficulty of access onto the properties from the narrow road and inadequate space has been allowed for the parking and turning on the forecourt of the properties. This could cause problems of residents and guests being forced to park on the narrow and busy road. The design of the properties has not given thought to problems of parking for cars and space for storage of bins for example.

The style of property in the proposed development doesn't blend in with the existing houses

in the village. The report alludes to previous planning application for four dwellings at this location. Outline planning was granted for four dwellings on the 12th of March 1998. However, the plot in question was much bigger and covered all the land up to the property at the rear, Langham House. So it was probably three or four times the size of the plot on which the development is now proposed.

The parish council is not against development on this site per se and we suggest that two detached properties or two semi detached properties in the centre of the plot, and in a design that's in keeping with the other properties in the village, would be much more appropriate. The developer suggests there's a need for this type of property to attract younger families to the village but history has shown that young families don't do well in Claxby because there are no facilities and transport is needed to get to schools and shops and amenities. We found that young families move out just under a short time because of this. So that is the objection from Claxby Parish Council. Thank you for your time."

The Chairman thanked Mr Beer for his statement and invited the next speaker, Agent for the Applicant Mr Sam Marriott, to address the Committee. Mr Marriott made the following statement.

"Evening Chairman, Committee. I'm Sam Marriott from Mother Architects agent this application.

Back in September, following design changes that were made following a public consultation event we held within the village, we had a provisional call to committee for this application, with officer's recommendation for approval, including conditions sent to us for confirmation. It was pulled the last minute. The LPA was suddenly and surprisingly adamant that the important open space allocation under LP23 was still valid on the site with a live outline permission in place for housing. The existing permission makes no mention of LP23 which is presumed to be due to multiple historic permissions for residential developments on the site.

Initially when challenged it was admitted by the LPA that the allocation was a last minute drag and drop exercise when forming the digital mapping for the Central Lincs Local Plan, with no review from 2006 and potential in error for doing so. Clear examples of LP23 errors can be seen locally, including half of the classrooms in Osgodby primary school, three houses in Binbrook, and omissions of various public open spaces. These have been demonstrated to the LPA in a document but dismissed as likely to be resolved under review of the local plan.

However the crux of the problem with the LPAs position, regardless of the likely mapping error is that LP23 open space allocation should no longer be applicable on the site regardless, as there's a live outline permission for residential development and there's multiple historic planning permissions for housing. This is not only our view as the agent, it's the initial legal view of a legal adviser who has sat and advised at this very committee on legals many times. It's also the opinion of our planning consultant, the previous manager here, Oliver Fitch-Taylor who oversaw the Central Lincs Local Plan as this policy come to fruition, and he has produced a detailed response, which the LPA have. Alongside these challenges to the LPA, we've also been consistently proactive in efforts to design a scheme that both conforms with LP23, a policy of no design requirement, and deliver appropriate and quality infill housing development.

Initially, we halved the number of units to two on the site, leaving an area completely clear. When asked about this land, it is our view that if the LPA were correct in the application of LP23 this land could not be developed as it would be protected. For reasons unclear this was disagreed, we again revised, based on feedback, and presented four units which has been considered this evening. The existing hedges to be retained with a full depth for soft landscaping behind to drastically screen the frontage along with the central driveway replacing the previous proposed dual entrances, the driveway now offers a clear view from public realm directly between the cottages, reserving both the feeling of openness and ensuring an entrance no wider than needed for a single home, it is also heavily planted to maintain a perceived break in the streets.

Still, it is the LPA's view that this still conflicts with LP23. It is becoming increasingly clear that recommendation for refusal is based solely on an impossible application of LP23 on land with residential permission already granted, causing a domino effect across multiple policies. Every mention of appropriate location within the local plan has been drawn down on giving the appearance of robustness in the officer's recommendation. It's crucial to remember in September, this application was set to come to committee with recommendation for approval, and the scheme has been improved multiple times since then,

When LP23 is put to one side, both the current report and September's recommendation make it clear that the proposal conforms with all relevant policy. It is not considered to adversely affect any residential amenity. It is not considered to be overdevelopment. For context of the scale of this site, the village church or surrounding greenery and footpaths would fit comfortably within it. The proposal would retain the core shape and form of the settlement, provide three additional units which is within the remaining seven unit growth allowance, be of an appropriate housing type of appropriate gardens amenity and parking.

As confirmed in officer's report the application conforms to the letter when reviewed against Central Lincs Local Plan policies when LP23 is negated. The proposal is for high quality family units on a good size infill site in a wholly appropriate location. The exact type of development the local and wider policy supports. It will see the delivery of homes the policymakers repeatedly state to strive to support. It is hoped that this evening's committee will offer that support too.

I believe most agents will openly admit it's not many times they feel a sense of relief when an application comes to committee. With this instance, we welcome the opportunity. The scheme is in an unfortunate position of stalemate, self-inflicted by the LPA. The key to unlocking it is at this committee. To have a well-designed scheme that we, as a practice are genuinely proud of, reviewed on its merits and put to democratic vote. Thank you"

The Chairman thanked Mr Marriott for his time and advised that the third speaker, Councillor Tom Regis, Ward Member, had submitted a statement to be read aloud. He asked the Democratic Services Officer to read the statement, which she did as follows.

"Following the Parish Council's original objection to the application for 4 semi detached properties on this small site, the plans were then altered to remove one half of the proposed development, leaving the other half of the site open for future development. The Parish Council objected to this on the grounds that the building of two properties on the left half of the site would not be in keeping with the line of existing properties on the road, as it would leave an unnecessary gap. This proposal was also seen by the Parish Council as a ploy to

build two properties now, then apply for a further two properties at a later date.

After objections to the amended plans, the most recent alteration to the application reverts to what is essentially the same design as the original, of 4 semi-detached houses (albeit slightly smaller) and the Parish Council wish to object again on the same basis, that it is an over-development of a small site in a rural village in an AONB.

The Parish Council is not against development on this site per se, and would suggest that 2 detached properties, or two-semidetached properties in the centre of the plot, with plenty of land and garden or recreation area around the properties would be much more appropriate.

The style of property in the proposed development does not blend in with existing houses in the village and the council would be more inclined to approve a design for 2 properties that is more in keeping with other properties in the village.”

The Chairman invited comment from Planning Officers and it was explained that the proposal was considered to be overdevelopment of the site, with a smaller development being in keeping with the area.

Members of the Committee expressed support for the refusal, on the basis of the proposal being over-developed for the land and surrounding area. There were concerns raised regarding amenities for young families and the amount of hard surfacing contained within the proposal. It was felt that a more sympathetic development could be produced.

Having been moved and seconded, the Chairman took the vote and it was unanimously agreed that permission be **REFUSED**.

72 143301 LAND TO THE WEST OF REEPHAM VILLAGE HALL

The next application was introduced as planning application number 143301, for change of use of agricultural land to dog exercising park, on land to the West of Reepham Village Hall, Hawthorn Road, Reepham, Lincoln. The Chairman requested any updates from the Planning Officer and it was explained that a further comment had been received from the Environmental Protection Officer, accepting the waste management plan, providing a contact number was added. That number was added to the plan by the applicant so there was a point of contact for residents or anyone using the site. The start time of 7am had also been accepted. The Officer then detailed the application for the Committee.

The Chairman explained there were three registered speakers, all of whom had submitted statements to be read aloud, and he asked the Democratic Services Officer to begin.

The first statement from the applicant, Joe Good, was read as follows:

“Mr Chairman and members of the planning committee, I am the applicant and local farmer and would like to introduce my proposed project.

This farm diversification proposal came forwards following a huge increase in dog owners over lockdown, and in turn a huge increase in dog walkers. Unfortunately many people are unable to keep to public footpaths which results in trespass causing crop loss, and

disturbance to wildlife which we are very keen to preserve. This is when the idea came to light.

The proposal consists of 2.5 acres of purpose sown dog grass with 2m high secure dog fencing and small car parking area for customers using this facility. People will be able to privately hire the exercise field for 1 hour slots from our website and receive a unique code to enter the dog park at the time of the booking.

The dog park is likely to attract:

- People training their young dogs
- Training dogs for a better recall
- Exercise for reactive dogs
- General off lead exercise

We will supply bio-degradable dog waste bags held within a dispenser. Supplied dog waste bin will be collected regularly by Biffa as stated in our waste/ odour management plan along with further details. Signage will be on site reminding customers of the rules and etiquette, mainly to promote picking up behind your pets. We will spot pick the field on a regular basis and monitor.

The proposal is located on a relatively unproductive field corner with existing access to Hawthorn road, screened by mature hedging. We feel a safe dog facility of this nature is missing, with only 1 other in Lincoln over 12 miles away.

Having spoken with local residents, the feedback we received was positive. Having liaised with a planning officer through a pre-application process, the feedback was positive.

A farm diversification project like this would bring positivity to the local farming business, whilst delivering a bespoke facility in Reepham.

Many Thanks,
Joe Good”

The second statement, from Ellis Purvis, was read as follows:

“The proposed times of 7 am are not ideal, this means people will be arriving before 7 am with potentially loud dogs and people hanging around. If the gates are not open they will be waiting outside on the road which is essentially outside our house which would cause a nuisance. Even if the gates are open it is still too close and the noise will be the same.

Is there a need for this? Has market research been done that proves that this is a need in the area? If so why does this need to be so close to residential property. Can this not be done opposite other agricultural land as there is ample amount on this road. This makes us question the motives. Could the land not be behind (north) of the Village Hall which would take it away from residential and put it out of sight.

We feel this would not enhance the area and potentially bring it down. This is planned directly opposite my house to which I have just built and planned an extension based around looking into the field which will now not be the case. This will affect the value of my house and the build therefore if I knew this prior, we may not have gone ahead with the build. The

proposed fence and carpark are not aesthetically pleasing and sounds very industrial even with the wood post fence proposed it still has wire fence between.

Lastly has the wildlife impact been assessed, we often see wild deers roaming in this area and would be a shame to lose that.

We therefore strongly object to the proposal.

Regards,
Ellis & Sarah Purvis”

The third and final statement, from Gary Brader, was read aloud as follows:

“Good evening Committee. We are residents living opposite the planned dog exercise area on Hawthorn Road. We have lived here since 2013 and one of the reasons for the purchase of the house was the lovely view across the open fields.

I strongly object to these plans because

1. Our main worry is that once the land has been converted from Agricultural to leisure use it would then become easier in the future to put in an application for planning for housing development. That would seriously effect the value of the homes opposite and seriously increase traffic. Can you assure us this will not be the case?

2. I feel that a 6 foot high steel mesh perimeter fence would be most unattractive.

3. I do not see the need for a new enclosed dog exercise area when we live in the countryside with many public bridleway's in close proximity including access to nearby field areas and the old airfield is very close by. I cannot see any reason the landowner would want to do this other than for future development of another kind for his own benefit. Once again I ask can you assure us this will not be the case?

In conclusion: we cannot see the benefit of this to anyone other than the landowner! Why would he do this and to what end?

If possible I would like to receive the minutes from the meeting in order to see the responses.

Many thanks for your time and consideration.

Kind regards
Gary Brader”

The Chairman thanked the Democratic Services Officer and invited further comment from the Planning Officer. He noted that it would not be reasonable to request an ecology report, housing was dealt with under a different policy and the application for consideration by the Committee was as presented.

The Chairman opened discussions for the Committee and there were considerable concerns raised regarding the potential number of dogs allowed on the site, the potential for parking

issues for local residents, the start time of sessions, particularly on weekend mornings as well as associated noise with animals and vehicle movements. Members suggested amended conditions regarding operational times and limiting the number of animals allowed at any one time. There were questions raised as to the viability of the proposal however it was highlighted that it was not the role of the Committee to assess viability, rather to decide whether the site and location was suitable for the application as presented.

There was significant discussion as to whether the hours of operation could be limited, for example shorter hours, earlier finishing times in winter months, longer hours in summer months. It was also suggested that the number of dogs should be limited in an effort to minimise disruption to local residents.

Members were advised by the Legal Adviser that the start time of operations had already been amended from 6am to 7am, with no objections raised by the Environmental Protection Officer. Should there be problems arising regarding noise complaints, these would be dealt with under other legislation and whilst conditions could be used to limit hours of operation, it had to be considered whether it was a reasonable and enforceable condition. It was noted that concerns regarding people using the site in darkness were not for the Committee to condition against and it was personal choice of the users as to whether they wished to walk their dogs after dark.

There was also uncertainty amongst Committee Members as to whether there was a need for such a site, however it was highlighted that the Committee were to decide whether it was a suitable location, rather than whether there was a need for it.

On hearing the repeated concerns of the Committee, and having had no proposer for the recommendation to grant permission, the Chairman proposed that the application be deferred for the next available meeting, on the understanding that further details were sought from the applicant regarding hours of operation, particularly through winter months, and numbers of dogs allowed at any one time. On having this proposal seconded, the vote was taken and it was unanimously agreed that the application be **DEFERRED** to the next available meeting.

73 143510 LAND OFF MIDDLE STREET INGHAM

The Chairman introduced the next application for consideration, number 143510 for erection of poultry farm for chicken production, including 6no. poultry houses, 1no. agricultural workers dwelling and associated infrastructure, at Johnnies Farm, land East of Plum Products Ltd, The Cliff, Ingham. The Officer updated the Committee that a signed completed copy of the unilateral undertaking had been received that day and there had been a comment received from the Department of Levelling Up Housing Communities stating they had no comment to make in relation to the environmental statement submitted with the application.

The Chairman stated there was one registered speaker, Mr Ian Pick, Agent for the Applicant. Mr Pick made the following statement.

“Thank you Chairman, Members. These planning applications involve a very complex process. Significant site selection criteria is required before we put forward these planning

applications into the planning system. The issues that we need to address with these types of planning applications relate to residential amenity. The sites need to be remote from neighbours in order to comply with the Environment Agency's rules for environmental permitting for the protection of amenity so, in terms of putting these applications forward, we have to model noise, we have to model odour, to make sure it complies with the Environment Agency criteria for the granting environmental permit. That was all done prior to submitting this planning application and the development site was compliant with those rules.

We also have to look at ammonia impact to offsite sites of ecological importance, which is following Environment Agency and Natural England criteria. We're looking at whether the development will have an adverse impact on ancient woodlands, local wildlife sites, special scientific interest or special areas of conservation. Our ammonia impact assessment for this development showed it was compliant with the Natural England and Environment Agency thresholds for the development. We've also got to look at highways. These developments require HGV access for food deliveries and the collection of the birds to take them to the factory and the removal of the manure, so we need good access to the main road network.

In terms of this site, we have the two tier consenting process. We need planning permission to build it and we need an environmental permit to operate it. We've already been granted the environmental permit to operate by the Environment Agency, and that covers matters of disposal of waste, residential amenity, noise, odour, ammonia, drainage. In terms of the highways' impacts of the development, we have been in negotiation with the Highway Authority, who came back to us wanting some improvement to the highway access. We have agreed to, and provided plans for, widening of the entrance and widening of the access road into the site so that two HGVs can pass. In terms of the ammonia issue, we are fully compliant with environmental permitting and Natural England regulations.

In terms of the consultation on this application, we've presented an application for a poultry unit. This type of development generally attracts some level of opposition, just for the nature of what it is. In this instance, we've got very few negative comments on this application. We do have concerns raised by the parish council with regard to odour and we've also got concerns raised by plum play with regard to odour issues. I can assure the Committee and the parish council and plum play that we have considered those issues in terms of our site selection and our odour impact assessment, and the Environment Agency are satisfied that there will not be a negative impact on any residents, or plum play, and the environmental permit has been granted to that effect.

Furthermore, in terms of the management of waste from this site, we have secured a contract to pull this into one of the litter burning power stations. We're not proposing any field heaps around the farm, we're not proposing any land spreading, we have simply, at the end of each cycle, lorries will come to the site will be loaded, sheeted and off it will go into the biomass power station and be disposed of for renewable energy purposes.

We've gone through a very significant process. We've been through full environmental impact assessments. We've been through a permit application with the Environment Agency and everything points to the direction that this site is exceptional for the proposed use. There are very few sites that we put forward, or very few sites that we look at, that are entirely suitable for this use and very few sites attract very little objection. This is one of them. The application has been recommended for approval and has no objection from any statutory

consultee. It is respectfully requested that planning permission is granted. Thank you.”

The Chairman thanked Mr Pick for his statement and, with no further Officer comment, invited Members of the Committee to speak.

A Member of the Committee enquired as to the road safety implications of increased HGV use on the road leading to the site and it was highlighted that Highways Agency had been involved and any concerns raised had already been addressed with the applicant. Members appreciated that developments of this nature tended to attract high levels of objections, which was not the case for this application.

Having been proposed and seconded, the Chairman took the vote and it was agreed that permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions.

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

1. The development hereby permitted must 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 must take place until a Construction Management Plan and Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan and Method Statement shall include:

- a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- c) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- d) wheel washing facilities;
- e) the routes of construction traffic to and from the site including any off site routes for the disposal of excavated material and;
- f) noise and dust mitigation measures
- g) measures to maintain unrestricted access to public right of way Ingh/16/1

The approved Construction Management Plan and Method Statement must be strictly adhered to throughout the construction period.

Reason: To ensure that the public highway is not impeded during the construction phase or affect the amenity of nearby uses to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, local policy LP13 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

3. No development shall take place until, suitably qualified contaminated land assessments and associated remedial strategy with none technical summaries, conclusions and recommendations, together with a timetable of works, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and the measures approved in that scheme shall be fully implemented. [Outcomes shall appropriately reflect end use and when combining another investigative purpose have a dedicated contaminative summary with justifications cross referenced]. The scheme shall include all of the following measures

unless the LPA dispenses with any such requirement specifically in writing

a) The contaminated land assessment shall include a desk study to be submitted to the LPA for approval. The desk study shall detail the history of the site uses and propose a site investigation strategy based on the relevant information discovered by the desk study. The strategy shall be approved by the LPA prior to investigations commencing on site.

b) The site investigation, including relevant soil, soil gas, surface and groundwater sampling, shall be carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a Quality Assured sampling and analysis methodology.

c) A site investigation report detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of analysis, risk assessment to any receptors and a proposed remediation strategy shall be submitted to the LPA. The LPA shall approve such remedial works as required prior to any remediation commencing on site. The works shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end-use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters.

d) Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a quality assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance. If during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the LPA.

e) Upon completion of the works, this condition shall not be discharged until a closure report has been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The closure report shall include details of the proposed remediation works and quality assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full in accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included in the closure report together with the necessary documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from the site.

Reason: In order to safeguard human health and the water environment and identify potential contamination on-site and the potential for off-site migration as recommended by the Environmental Protection Officer to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP16 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

4. No development must take place until the type and position (including a plan) of the following protected species measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Four hedgehog nesting boxes (placed in the base of hedgerows within the curtilage of the farm).

Eight bird nesting boxes (mixed design to be erected on suitable trees within the curtilage of the farm).

Eight bat roost boxes (erected on suitable trees within the curtilage of the farm)

The nesting and roost boxes must be installed prior to any operation or occupation of the site and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To respond to the recommendations of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) dated July 2021 to accord to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

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

5. With the exception of the detailed matters referred to by the conditions of this consent, the

development hereby approved must be carried out in accordance with the following proposed drawings:

- IP/WACR/04 dated April 2021 – Site Plan
- IP/WACR/03 dated April 2021 – Poultry Houses and Control Room Elevations and Floor plans
- IP/WACR/04 dated April 2021 – Occupational Dwelling Elevation, Floor and Roof Plans
- IP/WACR/05 dated April 2021 – Amenity Block Elevation, Floor and Roof Plans
- IP/WACR/06 dated April 2021 – Ancillary Structures Elevation and Floor Plans
- IP/WACR/07 dated August 2021 – Rainwater Harvester Pond Section and Floor Plan

The works must 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 local policy LP17, LP26 and LP55 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

6. The development hereby permitted must be construction from the following materials:

Poultry Buildings:

- Precast concrete walls to 450mm height with polyester coated profile sheeting elevations above in olive green above (RAL 6003).
- Polyester coated profile sheeting roof in olive green (RAL 6003).
- Black plastic roof mounted ventilation chimneys

Feed bins:

- Plastic and coloured olive green (RAL 6003)

Ancillary buildings:(control rooms, plant room, amenity building and dead bird store)

- Profile sheet clad walls and roof in olive green (RAL 6003)

Agricultural workers bungalow:

- Shire Autumn Russet 65mm Facing Brick
- Redland Cambrian interlocking slate effect roof tile
- White uPVC soft coat (Reflective Low) 1.4 u value doors and windows.

Reason: To ensure the use of materials which are appropriate to the agricultural use of the site and the open countryside to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP17, LP26 and LP55 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

7. Excluding the occupational dwelling no operation of the poultry units must take place until the surface water drainage scheme identified on drainage plan WAC-AWP-ZZ-XX-DR-C-3300 Revision P2 dated 25th August 2021 in appendix E of the Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment dated 25th August 2021 (issue A) has been fully completed. The approved surface water drainage scheme must be maintained and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate drainage facilities are provided to serve the built structures and hardstanding on the site to reduce the risk of flooding and to prevent the pollution of the water environment to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

8. No occupation of the dwelling must take place its surface water drainage scheme identified on drainage plan WAC-AWP-ZZ-XX-DR-C-3300 Revision P2 dated 25th August 2021 in appendix E of the Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment dated 25th August 2021 (issue A) has been fully completed. The approved surface water drainage scheme must be

maintained and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate drainage facilities are provided to serve the built structures and hardstanding on the site to reduce the risk of flooding and to prevent the pollution of the water environment to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

9. No operation of the amenity block or occupation of the dwelling must take place until it individual foul water drainage scheme identified on drainage plan WAC-AWP-ZZ-XX-DR-C-3300 Revision P2 dated 25th August 2021 in appendix E of the Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment dated 25th August 2021 (issue A) has been fully completed. The approved foul drainage scheme must be maintained and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate drainage facilities are provided to serve the built structures and hardstanding on the site to reduce the risk of flooding and to prevent the pollution of the water environment to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

10. The development must be completed in strict accordance with landscaping plan IPA1197-11 Revision B dated 11th November 2021. All planting or turfing comprised in the landscaping plan must be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following 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 must 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. The landscaping must be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that additional trees and hedging are provided on the boundaries of the site to soften its appearance to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policies LP17, LP26 and LP55 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

11. No operation of the development must take place until the access widening scheme identified on plan 19188-02 dated September 2021 has been fully completed. The approved access widening scheme must be maintained and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure safe access to and exit from the site by heavy good vehicles in the interests of highway safety to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP13 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

12. Apart from the bat roosts, bird boxes and hedgehog boxes described in condition 4 of this permission the development hereby approved must only be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out on page 21-23 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) dated July 2021.

Reason: To respond to the recommendations of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) dated July 2021 to accord to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

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

13. All animal waste and dirty water from the operation of the development must be removed from the site in accordance with paragraph 3.6 of the Environmental Statement dated July 2021.

Reason: To ensure that all manure and dirty water from the site is removed in an appropriate manner to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policies LP17 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

14. The bungalow hereby approved must not be occupied by any person other than the Farm/Site Manager responsible for the management of the hereby approved poultry site as outlined in red on location plan IP/WACR/01A dated September 2021 and any of their resident dependants.

Reason: The creation of permanent residential accommodation in this unsustainable location would not normally be permitted and could also undermine achievement of the Local Planning Authority's policy objectives on the management of housing supply. Residential occupation can only be supported in this instance in conjunction with an essential need for a rural operation to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP26 and LP55 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036

74 143367 LAND BETWEEN ELIZABETH CLOSE AND HAWTHORN CLOSE GLENTWORTH

Note: Councillor D. Cotton left the room at 8.24pm and returned at 8.26pm

The next application was introduced by the Chairman. Planning application number 143367, seeking permission for erection of 1no. dwelling being variation of condition 3 of planning permission 141174 granted 17 September 2020 - amendment to plans, on land between Elizabeth Close and Hawthorn Close, Glentworth, Gainsborough. The Planning Officer explained that there had been further representations received from number 16 Hawthorn Close. These were received beyond the consultation date and summarised as follows.

“The submitted plans may or may not be to scale. The applicant has significantly underestimated the size of the plot for the sole purpose of this work proposed. The watercourse has been moved entirely beyond the red boundary. Not all information has been provided in the Officer's report. From a site meeting that took place, a conversation hasn't been reported between Witham Internal Drainage Board and Lincolnshire County Council flood team regarding some information it said if it had come forward, we would have asked for the boxes to be set further back. The LCC flood team and Witham Internal Drainage Board have not provided any evidence to prove the alterations to the watercourse will not cause surface water flooding.”

Note: Councillor I. Fleetwood declared a non-pecuniary interest as he was a member of the Witham Third Drainage Board but had held no conversation regarding the application.

The Chairman stated there were three speakers, the first of whom had submitted a statement to be read aloud and he asked the Democratic Services Officer to do so.

The statement from Glentworth Parish Council was read as follows.

“Introduction

This statement is being made to request that the Planning Committee either refuse the application or defer a decision on the basis that the proposed development, even with the suggested alterations, is of an inappropriate scale for the site; the plans in front of the Committee are inaccurate and not to scale; there is an unknown risk in respect of surface water flooding as a result of work already done; and that the proposed solution to stabilising the bank of the watercourse is inappropriate. It is worth noting here that at the site meeting referenced in the report, the representative of the IDB stated that had an application for the works undertaken and proposed been made originally, or the original application referred to them, it would ‘likely have been refused’. The site meeting is mentioned on p130 of the report but there is no reference to this comment, although it was made in front of several witnesses.

All of these are material consideration that the Planning Committee should take into account and whilst the report addresses some aspects, it is the view of the Parish Council and the residents that the assurances of the developer and his agent are insufficient.

Background

Members of the Committee will be aware from the report and the comments on the Planning Portal of the strength of feeling this development and application has generated. On behalf of the Parish Council, I understand that many of the issues raised are not material in the context of the TCPA, but they do reflect the significant detrimental impact on local residents that the work done to date has had and ongoing concerns about the site. What is pertinent and material is that the need for this application supports the original contention that the site is not suitable for the proposed development.

The Parish Council, of course, understands that regardless of the decision in respect of this application there is an extant consent for a dwelling, that cannot be withdrawn. However, we would recommend that this application provides the Planning Authority with the opportunity to ensure that how that extant consent is implemented is appropriate for the location and minimises any further harm to the immediate surroundings of the site.

Specifics in the report

We should like to draw attention to some specific issues mentioned in the report, that are also referenced in comments you have received.

Plans not to scale – evidence has been supplied that both the overall site plans and the specifics in relation to the gabion baskets are not to scale. We note that the applicant’s agent has provided statements to the effect that the plans are accurate and that the totality of the development is within the ownership of the applicant. However, we believe it is incumbent on the LPA to assure itself of these issues, not to solely rely on one parties statement, particularly when it relates to the matter of flood risk and when there is evidence to the contrary;

Watercourse alterations – as the report states (penultimate para on p135), some work to the watercourse has already been made but it inaccurately states that this is limited to the placing of gabion baskets in the watercourse. Significant photographic evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the line, width and quite probably depth of the original watercourse has been changed – none of this work was authorised (or requested) within the original consent. The sole purpose of this work has been to extend and alter the size and shape of the development platform – photographic evidence showing the pegging out of the site and how that relates to the watercourse has been submitted, reflecting that the submitted plans are not an accurate reflection of what has been done.

Underground services – as with the comments from residents and the Parish Council to the original application, the question of the location of underground services and the impact of the development on these has not been adequately addressed. It came as little surprise to residents that at an early stage of the initial works the rising main was damaged, resulting in sewage spilling onto neighbouring properties and an extended period of disruption and pumping out by Anglian Water. We do not believe that this application should be granted or any further work should progress until the issue of underground services, easements and the impact on neighbouring properties is fully understood. It is worth noting that one of the reasons this site was not developed by Ben Bailey when the rest of Hawthorn Close was built was the understanding that there are extensive underground services.

Ecological Survey – the Parish Council notes and is pleased to see that Conditions 8 and 9 of the original consent are being retained. However, these are now broadly meaningless as the work done already has caused significant damage to the ecology of the area. As already mentioned, the unauthorised alterations to the watercourse will have caused significant damage to animal and plant life living in and adjacent to the watercourse. Additionally, as the Parish Council have pointed out to the Planning Enforcement Officer, the work done on the North bank of the watercourse (on land outside the development area and not in the applicant's ownership) may have caused severe damaged to trees, contrary to what the Ecological Survey stated.”

The five minute time limit was reached and so the Chairman requested the Officer cease reading. The next speaker, Sarah Pickering-Patterson was invited to address the Committee. She made the following statement, during which slides she had provided were shown to the Committee.

“This statement is being made requesting that the Planning Committee refuse the application.

The Planning Officer states in the report, the applicant's agent has provided statements that the site plans are accurate, and the entirety of the land and development is within the ownership of the developer which includes a signed Certificate A. However, Official copies of the HM Land Registry Title Deed Plans for 16 Hawthorne Close and for the development plot show otherwise. The agent and developer have made false declarations, even if unknowingly, the planning consent is invalid.

The Title Deeds in comparison with the site plan show parts of the development land encroaching on other people's land towards the Southern, Northern and Eastern boundaries marked in red. Part of the land on the southern boundary belongs to me. No notice has been served to me.

In terms of a legal position, Article 12 of the Town & Country Planning (Development Management) Procedure Order 2010, imposes a requirement, that all applications for planning permission must be accompanied by the correct certificate. This process has not been followed properly by the developer and Certificate, B, C or D should have been submitted, rendering this application and the original planning permission consent, invalid whether planning permission has been passed or not. This is not a boundary issue; this is a planning issue due to certificate A being signed. Even if unknowingly the permission consents are invalid.

Section 65(5) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 says that a local planning authority shall not “entertain” any application for planning permission where these requirements have not been satisfied. Signed Certificate A cannot lawfully be determined as the developer does not own all the land within the red line of boundary of the site plans.

The site plans are annotated ‘Do no scale, work only figured to dimensions. This means regardless of any information on the plans, they are not drawn to scale, are indicative only, and are subject to verification by a full site survey. This gives the developer room for manoeuvre to put the dwelling and the gabion wall exactly where they want to. If a complaint was raised that the gabions were larger, or the dwelling was built in the wrong place potentially breaching the plans, the LPA cannot establish this using these drawings. To ensure the development and gabion wall is built in accordance with the plans, adequate scale drawings are needed.

The applicant has significantly underestimated the size of the plot and the sole purpose of this work, has been to extend and alter the size and shape of the development platform, in order to fit the dwelling on the plot. The 2 pictures on the screen in front of you, show just how much land the developer has taken to extend the plot. You can clearly see the watercourse and the gabion wall are well beyond the red boundary line which is out of their ownership. There have also been trees cut down and damage to the vegetation on the northern boundary where he has breached the conditions in the original consent relating to the Ecological Survey. This is supposed to be protected but it’s been destroyed.

The photograph and HM Land Registry Title Plans on the screen, shows how the developer resized the plot. The developer pegged out the house but it didn’t fit and the back of the house overhung the watercourse. This proves that the watercourse and the gabion wall are beyond the red boundary line on the site plans.

As evidenced in the timeline of the photographs on screen, the watercourse has been moved in its entirety beyond the red boundary line on the site plans. The developer extended the plot by digging out the ground from the other side of the watercourse, dragging the soil forward to make the plot bigger. This is land beyond the red boundary line on the site plans.

The watercourse is a vital piece of infrastructure that carries away the surface water from Glentworth. The watercourse has been made much narrower from 2m to 6 inches in places, as evidenced in the photos on the screen.

At the site meeting, Witham IDB stated had an application been made before the works were completed, it would ‘likely have been refused’. This was made in front of several witnesses. There is no reference to this in the report.

I sent evidence to the Planning Officer via email of Witham IDB stating to LCC Flood Team “It is not good and if it had come forward for consent, we would have asked for the front of the gabions to be set further back”. There is no reference to this in the report.

Conclusion:

I therefore ask that the Planning Committee refuse this application based on all the facts evidenced, but in particular, that signed Certificate A cannot lawfully be determined, because the developer does not own all the land within the boundary of the site plans invalidating all of the planning permissions.”

The Chairman thanked the speaker for her time and invited the final speaker, Councillor P. Howitt-Cowan, speaking as Ward Member, to address the Committee. Councillor Howitt-Cowan made the following statement.

“Thank you for allowing me to speak this evening in the light of your crowded agenda. The last two speakers have provided you with some very concerning details, and in my humble opinion, this retrospective planning application is possibly the worst one I've ever come across. It is from beginning to end a dangerous cocktail and a textbook case for planning training.

Let's together look at the very beginning. The builder purchased a piece of land avoided by previous developers to build a dwelling and not carried out the measurements and discovers the dwelling this committee approved will not fit the piece of land. The land is too small for the substantial dwelling he proposes. He has already advertised it for sale because he has built it and he has a huge problem. He therefore identifies the southern boundary where a stream runs and without permission sets to with gabions to claim land in order for his proposed dwelling to fit. This is encroachment but others would use another term to describe this kind of action and this has deliberately interfered with a watercourse.

He is then forced to apply for retrospective planning permission. And you have heard that had he applied originally, he would most likely not have been granted permission. Therefore why grant it retrospectively? Flooding is an important consideration due to climate change and we were told that the water course was only assessed for its current flow and not for the future problems that could arise potentially so there is room for significant flooding possibly in the future.

But this stream is an important conduit of flood water in this village. The excavation of the stream has affected its ecology, damaging animal life, plant life and even the trees on the north side of the stream, which is outside our remit. We should be better stewards of conserving not vandalising it.

Moreover, more seriously, we have heard doubt cast on the paperwork for this application. It appears that it has been taken at face value. Official copies of Her Majesty's land registry title deeds plans for 16 Hawthorn Close and for the development plot reinforce doubt the agent and developer have, it is alleged, made false declarations even if unknowingly, the planning consent is invalid. False application by default invalidates all applications. The process the applicant has followed may be fundamentally flawed because of the questions about land ownership. Apparently he has declared he owns all the land but there is very

strong evidence he does not. The certificate A submitted with the original application may well be wrong, which would mean the original consent is invalid. For the LPA, you'll appreciate this could have serious consequences and suggest deferral to check this property, would be the minimum outcome of this meeting.

Where may we go with this one? Defer for future investigation, or refuse outright retrospective planning permission, which would mean that the builder would have to reapply for a dwelling with the correct measurements that would fit the piece of land he has purchased, subject to all his paperwork being in order and thereby not interfering with the stream. Thank you”

The Chairman thanked Councillor Howitt-Cowan for his time, and, before opening the floor to comments, noted that there had been several mentions of incorrect certificates and whether the application was valid for the Committee to determine. He enquired of Planning Officers to clarify.

It was explained that the site had extant planning permission that would not be superseded. The Committee was being asked to look at a variation of the conditions and the original planning permission would stand. With regards to comments from the drainage board, they did not grant planning permission, their comments would not relate to the granting or otherwise of planning permission. In relation to land ownership, it was noted that permission could be sought for land outside of an individual's ownership and the concern as to whether the title deeds were accurate was an administrative matter outside the remit of the Planning Committee. It did not affect the decision making considerations of the Committee. These comments were echoed by the Legal Adviser and the Chairman opened for comments from the Committee.

There was considerable discussion as to the sizing of the property, the question over the land ownership and the comments regarding the alteration of the watercourse. The position of the Committee, in considering the application for variation of conditions, was reiterated. A Member of the Committee quoted the comments from Lincolnshire County Council, where there were no issues raised, and it was confirmed that the purpose of gabion boxes was to shore up the banks of the watercourse.

There was further discussion regarding the concerns raised by both the Parish Council and the objector, however, on citing the purpose of the application, there was acceptance amongst some Members of the Committee that such concerns did not impact the decision to be made by the Committee.

Having been moved and seconded, the Chairman took the vote. With a majority vote it was agreed that permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions.

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

1. - Void

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

2. - Void

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

3. 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: ZD/G/21 and ZD/G/P2 received 1st September 2020 and ZD/G/21P1 Rev b dated 1/11/21. Works shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the approved plans and to accord with policies LP17 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The facing materials specified in the Materials Sample Board document received 29/1/21, and approved under application 142367, shall be used in the construction of the dwelling.

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate materials to accord with policy LP17 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details under application 142367, and with the relevant consents from the water board.

Reason: To ensure adequate drainage facilities are provided to serve the development in accordance with Policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

6. - Void

7. All planting or turfing shown on plan ZD/G/21P1 Rev b dated 1/11/21 must be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following 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 must 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. The landscaping should be retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and nature conservation to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

8. The development hereby approved must only be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out in section 5 (pages 21-22) of the preliminary ecological appraisal survey completed in August 2020 by Whitcher Ecological Consultants Ltd.

Reason: In the interest of nature conservation to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

9. The development must be completed in accordance with the tree protection measures identified within the arboricultural method statement by AWA Tree Consultants dated May 2020. The approved protection measures must be installed prior to commencement and

retained in place until the development is completed.

Reason: To safeguard the existing trees on the site during construction works, in the interest of visual amenity to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP17 and LP21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

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

10. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2 Part 1 (including Classes A, B, C, D, and E) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) Order 2015, or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order, the dwelling hereby permitted shall not be altered or extended, no new windows shall be inserted, and no buildings or structures shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling unless planning permission has first been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable any such proposals to be assessed in terms of their impact on the resulting amount of space around the dwelling and to safeguard the character and appearance of the building and its surroundings.

75 143287 REGANGROOM EAST FERRY ROAD LAUGHTON

Planning application number 143287 was introduced, seeking permission for access track, car park and footpaths, lodge building to create 1no. residential dwelling, kennels and office space, 3no. animal pens, conversion of caravan to onsite office space, 2no. poly tunnels, enlargement of lake and other timber structures. Retention of former kennels to use as pig shed, caravan to be used as an office, wooden structure with shed and containers for shelter/gardening activities and storage, at Regangroom, East Ferry Road, Laughton.

The Chairman advised there were no speakers registered, and, with no updates from the Officer, opened for comments from the Committee.

Members were supportive of the arrangements at the location and, whilst a Member of the Committee raised concerns regarding vehicle movements on the farm land, it was confirmed that it was a shared access and there was right of access for a number of residents.

Having been moved and seconded, the Chairman took the vote and it was agreed that permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions.

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

1. The development is permitted for a temporary period expiring on 2nd December 2024 when the moveable dwelling and any ancillary structures shall be removed from the site unless prior to that date the planning permission has been granted by the Local Planning Authority for its retention.

Reason: Permission has been granted in this case to enable the Local Planning Authority to assess whether the business being established requires permanent residential accommodation for a worker to live at or near his/her place of work in accordance with policy

LP55 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

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

None

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

2. The occupation of the lodge shall be restricted to a person or persons solely or mainly employed, or last employed prior to retirement, or a widow or widower of such a person, and to any resident dependants of the business detailed in this application.

Reason: The site is in a rural area where permission for new development is granted only where it is essential to meet an agricultural or other special need, in accordance with policy LP55 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

3. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment (ref: 21401) and the following mitigation measures it details:
- Finished floor levels of the lodge building shall be set no lower than 7.6 metres above Ordnance Datum (AOD)

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants.

4. With the exception of the detailed matters referred to by the conditions of this consent, the works hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:

21401-02 E

21401-04 C

21401-05 A

21401-06 B

PRT-02-0052-000

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.

5. The business proposed in this application shall only be open between the hours of 9:00 and 16:30 Monday – Friday and shall be closed at weekends and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenities of nearby properties and the locality to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

6. The proposal shall be limited to 24 users a day.

Reason: To limit vehicle movements in order to protect the amenities of nearby properties and the locality to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

7. Within 3 months of the date of this permission, details of the screening to be provided, as

shown on the attached plan, shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved screening shall be carried out in the first planting season following the approval of the details. Any trees 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: In the interests of amenities of nearby properties and the locality to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

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

None

76 140235 FORMER LINDSEY SHOPPING CENTRE GAINSBOROUGH

The Chairman introduced the final planning application of the evening, number 140235 for demolition of the former Lindsey Shopping Centre and proposal to develop multiplex cinema, car parking and commercial units in the following use classes, Class A1 (shops), Class A2 (financial and professional services), Class A3 (restaurants and cafes), Class A4 (drinking establishments), Class A5 (hot food takeaways) and Class D2 (assembly and leisure), together with associated works, at the former Lindsey Shopping Centre, Market Place, Gainsborough.

It was explained that, as part of the sale agreement, the former Lindsey Shopping Centre would be demolished. However, the existing condition would require the scheme of archaeological work prior to demolition. Therefore, to allow the seller to demolish and the developer/buyer to commission the archaeological work, it was proposed to amend the condition to the following:

4. No development (other than demolition) shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This should consist of set piece archaeological excavation and shall also include the following
 1. An assessment of significance and proposed mitigation strategy (i.e. preservation by record, preservation in situ or a mix of these elements).
 2. A methodology and timetable of site investigation and recording.
 3. Provision for site analysis.
 4. Provision for publication and dissemination of analysis and records.
 5. Provision for archive deposition.
 6. Nomination of a competent person/organisation to undertake the work.
 7. The scheme to be in accordance with the Lincolnshire Archaeological Handbook.

Reason: To ensure the preparation and implementation of an appropriate scheme of archaeological mitigation and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

This would allow only works of demolition to take place and would still require the

appropriate archaeological scheme of investigation prior to any further works.

The Committee were advised that the following response had been received from Archaeology:

“Yes in principal that would be fine, provided that demolition is clearly defined as only removing existing buildings down to current ground level. If they want to grub out existing foundations or do any other disturbance below the current ground surface that needs to trigger the archaeological requirements.

It is really difficult to know what remains might survive here as so little work has happened in the middle of Gainsborough. It's possible everything was destroyed when the current buildings went up, but it is also possible that very significant remains from the Saxon and medieval town may still survive here which would need to be recorded very carefully.

Therefore it is suggested to put other than demolition to ground level only.”

Having been proposed and seconded, it was unanimously agreed that permission be **GRANTED**.

77 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS

The Determination of Appeals was **DULY NOTED**.

The meeting concluded at 9.20 pm.

Chairman