

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the reconvened Meeting of the Planning Committee held via Virtual - MS Teams on 24 August 2020 commencing at 6.30 pm.

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

Councillor Owen Bierley
Councillor David Cotton
Councillor Michael Devine
Councillor Jane Ellis
Councillor Cherie Hill
Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne
Councillor Keith Panter
Councillor Roger Patterson
Councillor Mrs Judy Rainsforth
Councillor Mrs Angela White

In Attendance:
Alan Robinson Director of Corporate Services and Monitoring Officer
Russell Clarkson Interim Planning Manager (Development Management)
George Backovic Principal Development Management Officer
Rachel Woollass Development Management Team Leader
Ian Elliott Senior Development Management Officer
Martin Evans Senior Development Management Officer
Danielle Peck Development Management Officer
Martha Rees Legal Advisor
Ele Snow Democratic and Civic Officer
James Welbourn Democratic and Civic Officer

Apologies: Councillor Matthew Boles
Councillor Mrs Cordelia McCartney

Membership: No substitutes were appointed for the meeting

26 REGISTER OF ATTENDANCE

Note: The meeting reconvened at 6:30pm

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

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

27 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

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

28 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 22 July 2020 be confirmed as an accurate record.

29 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor A. White declared that she was a Member of Nettleham Parish Council (reference agenda items 6a and b, application numbers 140938 and 141032) however she had not taken part in any previous discussions and would therefore retain her seat as a Member of the Planning Committee.

Councillor J. Milne declared that as Ward Member for Lea (reference agenda item 6e, application number 139840) she would be standing down from the Planning Committee and speaking as Ward Member.

30 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT/LOCAL CHANGES IN PLANNING POLICY

The Committee heard from the Interim Planning Manager (Development Management) who explained that on 6 August 202, the Government launched its planning white paper “Planning for the Future” promising to “streamline process, cut red tape and harness technology”. Consultation would close on 29 October 2020.

Some of the key reforms proposed, included:

- All land to be categorised into “Growth”, “Renewal” and “Protected” Areas;
- Local Plans should set clear rules rather than general policies for development.
- A new emphasis on engagement at the plan-making stage. At the same time, they would streamline the opportunity for consultation at the planning application stage, because this added delay to the process and allowed a small minority of voices, some from the local area and often some not, to shape outcomes.
- Change from a process reliant on documents, to a process driven by data, with standardized data sets;
- A new focus on design and sustainability, and to ensure the planning system supported efforts to combat climate change;
- Introduce Local Design guidance and codes
- The Infrastructure Levy, a new nationally-set value-based flat rate charge, to replace the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and S106 planning obligations;

The link for the Government White Paper was to be shared with Members:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future>

Neighbourhood Plans

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Morton NP | Submission consultation (Reg16) ends 7 Sept 2020. |
| Normanby and Owmbly NP | Normanby by Spital and Owmbly by Spital PCs have decided to now do their own NPs for their parish areas only. Previously they were preparing a joint NP which will be withdrawn. |

A Member of Committee enquired about the press coverage regarding amendments to Planning Legislation and how this would be managed within the district. It was suggested there could be some communications sent out to the wider community in order to assist understanding.

31 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

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

32 140938 - PLANNING APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF 33NO.ENTRY LEVEL HOMES AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE - PHASE 2. "LAND OFF", DEEPDALE LANE, NETTLEHAM

The first application of the evening was introduced for Members' consideration. Planning application number 140938 for construction of 33no.Entry Level homes and associated infrastructure - Phase 2. "Land off", Deepdale Lane, Nettleham. The Development Management Team Leader explained three further representations had been received from 8 Midway, 24 Baker Drive and 30 Baker Drive. One representation suggested that the site should be made into allotments however the proposal applied for was dwellings and was assessed as such. No other new matters had been raised that had not already been addressed in the officer's report. The recommendation remained the same.

She added that a change was required for recommended condition 7 in order for this to read correctly. It was suggested that the words "of that phase has been" should be changed to "shall be".

Condition 7 would then read - Prior to occupation, a schedule of landscape management and maintenance for a minimum period of five years from the completion of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

The s106 currently had not been signed therefore it was requested if Members moved the

recommendation they delegate back to officers to complete the s106.

The Chairman invited the first speaker to address the Committee.

Councillor John Evans, of Nettleham Parish Council made the following statement:

“Local strength of feeling on this matter can be judged by the large number of submissions in opposition from the community. But we do understand that developments such as this must be judged on planning grounds.

The Parish Council **strongly objects** to this application and respectfully requests that the committee should refuse this application 140938 for 33 homes off Deepdale Lane on the following planning grounds:

1. This is not an allocated site in the adopted Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan (Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan) or CLLP.
2. The developer claims that this is an entry-level exception site so under NPPF 71 development on an unallocated site is permissible. However the proposal is contrary to para b) of the NPPF 71 as it does not comply with the design policies or standards as per D-6 and D-3 of Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan.

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan D-6 clearly states that new development should recognize and reinforce the local character in terms of height, scale, density, spacing, layout orientation, features, and materials. This is supported by LP26 c).

The Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan also identifies the max density for new homes in Nettleham as 20 homes per Ha, which is reflected in the adjacent Phase 1 development by Larkfleet/Allison Homes. This proposal seeks to almost double that housing density leading to an inappropriate urban density in a rural village setting.

The design and access statement seeks to justify this high density by comparing it to that of the adjacent residential care home development. This includes apartment style accommodation for older people so would be a totally inappropriate and invalid as a comparison for a housing development such as this.

3. The Design and Access statement makes reference to under delivery of affordable houses in the CLLP area but only uses historical data the most recent being 3 years ago.

Over the past 3 years Nettleham alone has had planning permission approved which includes 71 affordable homes, a significant over delivery against the 37 identified as required in the Neighbourhood Plan. LP11 calls for 20% of new housing allocation in rural locations to be affordable, which equates to 47 here.

Recent developments in Nettleham have already delivered 45 of that total. So Nettleham is already over delivering.

4. Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan policy D-3 states very specific minimum parking

requirements to avoid the parking clutter that is seen on many new housing developments. This proposal falls short by some 17 parking spaces against those requirements.

It is clear that none of the properties have garages and the parking provision is in place of a front garden. This is more usual in urban developments and does not reflect the character of Nettleham.

LP13 of the CLLP states the need to consider surrounding conditions and cumulative impact, but without stating specific parking numbers. We contend that in a high density setting in cul-de-sacs like this it would clearly not be appropriate and would lead to parking chaos.

Please note that guidance from LCC highways is just that, and **not a statutory planning requirement, which the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan is.**

Nettleham Parish Council submits that based on the above grounds alone, this opportunistic planning application should be refused. It is contrary to the adopted Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan and not compliant with NPPF 71 b.

However should the LPA be minded to approve the development then provision for children's play equipment on site should be required (via S106 agreement) as the distance to the nearest play area is some 700m. away along Deepdale Lane a busy access route into Nettleham.

Deepdale Lane lacks a footpath on the development side the lane, so for safety and amenity purposes there should also be a S106 requirement for the developer to be required to provide one to meet up with the existing footpath on the north side of the road."

The Chairman thanked Councillor Evans and invited the second speaker, Mr Mark Mann, to address the Committee.

Mr Mann thanked the Committee for their time. He explained he was the Planning Director for Larkfleet Homes, the applicant. He stated that the proposal was for a small development of entry level homes as defined by paragraph 71 of the revised NPPF published in February 2019. He clarified the purpose of entry level homes was to assist young people to get a step on the property ladder, especially in rural areas. He highlighted a shortfall of affordable homes in the district and stated that the development would help to address that shortfall. He noted the objections to the development however stated it was not part of the open land that would be handed to residents in the area and that, without the addition of paragraph 71 to the NPPF, the land would likely be identified for development during the next review of the Local Plan. He explained it was a logical location for further development and it was the introduction of paragraph 71 that led the company to consider the land for development. He stated that the introduction of paragraph 71 removed, overnight, any objection to potential development. He highlighted that in terms of design the proposals were in line with Phase 1 of the development in the area and that, although the density was higher, this was as a result of the nature of affordable homes. He referenced the Officer's report in terms of higher density being allowed in consideration of affordable homes. It was pointed out that the developers had taken on board comments made the Parish Council and repeated that the development would provide much-needed affordable housing in the area. He noted there were

no objections from key consultees and that the Officer had recommended approval as the development was in line with the criteria set out by paragraph 71. He thanked the Committee for their time and requested that Members support the Officer recommendation for approval.

The Chairman thanked Mr Mann for his time and introduced the third speaker of the evening, Sally Lidbury.

Note: The Chairman declared a non-prejudicial interest in that he had worked with Sally Lidbury approximately eight years previously but had had no contact with her since then, and none in relation to this application.

Sally Lidbury then made the following statement:

"I have been asked to speak on behalf of residents of Nettleham Chase. We have many concerns about the quality and integrity of the developer, but fully appreciate this is not the forum to share our concerns.

Housing Needs

The land off Deepdale Lane in Nettleham was allocated for development within the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan. The number of dwellings allocated for this area was approximately 50. We feel it is important to highlight that there are already 86 dwellings within this area. **36 more** than suggested within the neighbourhood plan.

We do not feel that sufficient evidence has been provided, by the developer, in relation to the **need** for affordable homes in our village.

Residents of Phase 1 were told that the quota of affordable homes had been met by the **36 Lace Housing dwellings. This equates to 42%.**

If this application were to be approved, along with 141032, it would mean that **60% of dwellings on the development** would be affordable housing.

The 76 affordable homes on this development would be on one side of the road and the 50 private dwellings on the other! Planning guidance states that new residential developments should support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities. We do not feel this proposal is at all balanced.

It is our understanding that Nettleham has already exceeded its quota of affordable housing. Have the following been taken into consideration....

112 dwellings in development off off Lodge Lane and Scothern Road

57 proposed dwellings off Scothern Road and The Hawthorns

The planning officer's report states that a *local needs* survey was not available so instead, a West Lindsey housing register was used to determine need.

The Nettleham Neighbourhood plan states that housing needs to 2031 show that a total housing growth in the region of 180 dwellings. This was assessed as appropriate to meet local needs.

That equates to 45 affordable homes being built in future developments up to 2031. This

figure has already been surpassed.

Density

The Village Design Statement states that the scale and proportion of buildings should **complement and reflect** surrounding dwellings and buildings. We feel this proposal does not.

The Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan states that a density of 20 homes per hectare for future developments. This proposal is 34 homes per hectare. This figure is even higher when the Phase 2 site is looked at collectively.

The planning officer's report states that the proposal **reflects** existing residential densities in the locality. The existing housing is **21 dwellings per hectare** whereas this proposal is 34. We do not feel the proposal reflects the existing residential density.

In its conclusion, the officer's report attempts to make a comparison to the existing LACE development. It states that the proposal reflects the locality's density. We do not feel this is a fair comparison as the dwellings are of a completely different type - 22 **apartments** and 14 bungalows.

We feel a comparison of density of similar house types would provide greater clarity.

Ecological Change & Impact

We feel there has been a lack of ecological response in relation to this application. There is no up to date report to support this planning application and the impact it would have on the environment and wildlife. The last report was for phase 1 and is now over 2 years old.

Within two weeks of the development site becoming silent, due to the national Covid-19 lockdown, residents noticed a significant amount of wildlife returning to the planned site. Sadly, this dramatically reduced when the site reopened.

We can confirm that we do have a population of bats living and roosting in and around this development, as well as owls and other wildlife. We would urgently suggest this matter is thoroughly investigated.

Open Space

Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments optimise the potential of the site, including green and other public space.

The 'Design & Access Statement' states that 'significant amounts of open space are to be provided within phase 1 and will be accessible to residents of phase 2'. We would like to question the validity of this statement.

Given the density of this proposal, we do not feel adequate provision of open space has been provided in accordance with policy LP24 of the CLLP. The planning officer's reports states that within the red line plan is an area to the south of the pond which can be utilized.

We do not feel this suggestion of green space is suitable, on the grounds of safety. Both in terms of the open water and its close proximity to Deepdale Lane – where there has recently been an identified issue with speeding traffic. These points have not be included in the planning officer's report.”

The Chairman introduced the final speaker for the application, Councillor Giles McNeill, Ward Member for Nettleham.

Councillor McNeill thanked the Chairman and stated that the issue to be considered was the weight to be given to NPPF paragraph 71 in contrast to the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan. He stated that paragraph 71 was not a blank cheque for entry level housing to be agreed without due consideration. There was criteria that needed to be met. He stated that the development did not meet local design policy and standards. This was covered within the Local Plan, the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan and Design Statement. He commented that the development failed to meet the character of the area and important design principles. Councillor McNeill stated that it breached the policy for amenity and open space and was contrary to sustainable growth. He highlighted that development within the area was already over 26% above what had been identified and the proposed development did not take into consideration the identity of the village community. He felt that the development failed to demonstrate it would contribute to an efficient and safe transport infrastructure nor address issues regarding parking spaces for the new houses which was already an existing issue down Deepdale Lane. He thanked the Chairman for the time and suggested the application should be considered for refusal.

The Chairman thanked all speakers and invited comments from the Officer who highlighted that there were conditions proposed to deal with the concerns regarding the pond, open space, landscaping and maintenance and she also noted that the Neighbourhood Plan predated the Central Lincolnshire Plan and the NPPF. The Chairman then invited comments from Committee Members.

There was considerable discussion regarding the location of such a development and that it was contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan. The requirements for entry level housing were clarified with the Officer, who confirmed the need area was central Lincolnshire however advice had been sought from the Housing Team within the Council for local need. There was uncertainty as to how weighting should be given to paragraph 71 in comparison to the Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan. The Legal Advisor confirmed that all plans together formed the development plan on which to base their considerations, however, the newest plan should take precedence and in this case, that was the introduction of paragraph 71 in February 2019. It was also highlighted that section b of paragraph 71 stated any proposals must meet local standards and designs.

After further discussion regarding the impact on the village and local area, in relation to significantly higher density housing than agreed for other developments, a Member of Committee proposed the refusal of the application as contrary to LP26, design and amenity, NPPF paragraph 71 section b and D3 and D6 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This proposal was duly seconded.

On being put to the vote it was agreed that planning permission be **REFUSED** as contrary to LP26, design and amenity, NPPF paragraph 71 section b and D3 and D6 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

33 141032 - PLANNING APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF 2NO.AFFORDABLE ELDERLY PERSONS BUNGALOWS AND 5NO. HOMES.

The second application of the night was introduced. Application number 1411032 for erection of 2no.affordable elderly persons bungalows and 5no. homes on land off Deepdale Lane, Nettleham. The Senior Development Management Officer explained there was an amendment to the recommendation. It is now recommended that committee delegate powers to officers to finalise the section 106 agreement then grant planning permission subject to the conditions in the report.

The final recommended condition should be number 12 not 11.

He added that since the report was drafted further objections had been received from residents of 40 Deepdale Lane, 16 Baker Drive, and Orchard Cottage 18 The Crescent, Nettleham summarised as follows:

- This is typical of builder getting onto a site then flexing their wings.
- Nettleham was a village, now the Council are allowing any building if the builder mentions social housing.
- Loss of property value due to this development but Council Tax remains the same.
- Ridge and furrow earthworks have been lost on the existing development. The developer should be made to make good, not tarmac them over.
- Does the Council exist for the people of the builder?
- More houses on the edge of the village, pressure on village amenities which are not coping now.
- Roads cannot cope with more traffic and roads into the village are dangerous.
- There is already another development on Scothern Road which will increase traffic.
- It is time to say enough is enough to these greedy developers.

He stated that these objections did not alter the recommendation.

The Chairman invited the first speaker to address the Committee.

Councillor John Evans, of Nettleham Parish Council, made the following statement.

“The Parish Council **strongly objects** to this application and respectfully requests that the committee should refuse this application 141032 for 7 homes off Deepdale Lane on the following grounds:

1. It does not comply with the design policies or standards as per D-6 of the adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan D-6 (supported by LP26) clearly states that new housing developments should recognize and reinforce the local character in terms of height, scale, density, spacing, layout orientation, features, and materials.

The Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan identifies the typical max density as 20 homes per Ha for housing developments. This is reflected in the adjacent housing development for 50

homes currently being completed by Larkfleet/Allison Homes. This proposal seeks to roughly double that housing density leading to an inappropriate urban density in a rural village setting.

The design and access statement seeks to justify this high density by comparing this housing density to that of the nearby sheltered accommodation. This offers apartment style accommodation for older people, plus some older persons bungalows. It would therefore be totally inappropriate and invalid point of comparison for a housing development such as this.

The proposed high density design is totally at odds with what has been built on the rest of the housing development on opposite side of the road, where garages and front gardens are provided.

2. Car parking provision has been made on hard standings on land at the front of the houses, which would normally be front gardens. This is a sensitive visual area on the left-hand side of a right hand bend on the principle estate road near the entrance to the estate.

The location on a bend on the principal estate road also requires consideration from a road safety perspective as cars parked at the locations could obstruct views of young children from drivers using the principle estate road.

3. Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan policy D-3 states very specific minimum parking requirements to avoid parking clutter. Parking across footpaths is frequently seen on many new housing developments where insufficient parking provision has been made.

The requirements of D-3 have not been met here for the 3 and 4 bed properties.

There is no conflict here between Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan D-3 and LP13, as LP13 specifically does not allocate spaces, the CLLP states:

"4.7.11 It is not proposed to set specific parking standards within this Local Plan but rather to allow for each proposal to be considered on a case by case basis".

Reference has been made to LCC highways guidance but this is not a strategic policy.

The parking standards in D-3 are part of the character of Nettleham's estates and should be respected in any planning considerations.

This application fails to comply with the adopted Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan in character, density, design and parking provision and we respectfully request that the application is rejected."

The second speaker, Mr Mark Mann, applicant, was then invited to speak.

Mr Mann explained this this scheme was on an allocated site and therefore the principle of development was already accepted both in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan. The scheme was very similar in design and materials to those houses in phase 1 of the development and the house types were similar as well. The houses were to be slightly smaller as it was part of an affordable housing scheme and it was also slightly higher density, however this was allowed for in the Local Plan. He highlighted that there was a requirement for affordable homes in the district and this development would contribute to the number of affordable houses. In respect to concerns about car-parking issues, there would be parking spaces rather than garages and each home would have rear garden space as

well. The provision of bungalows was additional and he stated that the proposed development did comply with the Neighbourhood Plan, the Local Plan and the NPPF. He thanked the Chairman for his time.

The Chairman then requested that the third registered speaker address the Committee.

Sally Lidbury, speaking in opposition to the development, made the following statement.

“The points raised in the previous application in relation to the ecological impact and green space still stand. Furthermore, this application replies on infrastructure within 140938.

Traffic & Parking

The planning officer's report states that 'it is not considered that there would be an unacceptable impact on parking or highway safety'. We do not believe this reflects the safety concerns of residents.

Deepdale Lane is a busy access road to the village. It also provides the main access to the Lincolnshire Police and Fire Headquarters. Additional dwellings would bring further traffic to this busy road. A speeding issue has already been identified, with the recent installation of an automatic speed safety road sign. This issue is not referred to within the planning officer's report.

Baker Drive has one narrow access and egress point. There are two points on the road through the development (Baker Drive) where cars struggle to pass. With extra cars this will cause even more congestion and potentially a risk to safety.

There is a significant lack of roadside parking available on the proposed development, given the density of dwellings. This could result in parked vehicles spilling onto Baker Drive, creating a hazard. Given the width of the road, vehicles would also need to park on the pavement to ensure road users could pass. This could impact on pedestrian access to pavements. We know of a number of existing residents who require wheelchair access.

Furthermore, we would like to draw your attention to the poor condition Baker Drive has been left in at various points over the last few months. The mud left on the road by the developer has caused a safety concern for both drivers and pedestrians. Keeping the site safe has also been an on-going concern, with it being left open and unlocked during working hours.

We feel these points should be given further consideration on the grounds of safety. Furthermore, within in the transport statement, there is no mention of the current or planned housing development within the village. We feel this should be taken in consideration.

The Land

The planning officers report states that the site is currently being used as a mix of fenced off overgrown land and the construction compound for the adjacent estate development. We would like to make the point that this land has been used by both Lindum and Larkfleet as their site storage areas. We were told prior to purchase, that once building works were completed, the land would be returned to farm land as per their advertising material. It should not be considered as 'overgrown land' for the purposes of this application.

Amenity Space and Storage

Policy D-6 of the NNP states that new developments should provide sufficient external amenity space, refuse and recycling storage facilities and car parking. It goes on to say that the appearance and location of such features should be considered to ensure that they are well integrated into development proposals and form part of a cohesive and visually appealing environment. We feel insufficient weight has been given to this aspect.

In the planning officer's report refers to 'the frontage parking arrangement is perhaps the most conspicuous element of the proposal given it forms a bank of parking on a bend in the road'. As residents living on this street, we feel this does not reflect the current appearance.

In addition to this, we wonder where utility bins will be stored? Given the size of gardens and limited access to the rear, will they be stored in front of the dwellings? This again would not reflect the design or appearance of our street. We feel this point has been given sufficient weight.

Well-being

We feel there has been a lack of consideration to those living in phase 1, who were incidentally told by the same developer, that the land would not be developed! It should also be noted that those residents who occupy the over 55's accommodation adjacent to the site are deeply concerned about the impact this proposed development would have on their health and well-being. We do not feel sufficient weight has been given to these points.

Additional Considerations:

Whilst we appreciate the following is not a material consideration, we feel it is right to bring to your attention the complete lack of transparency demonstrated by the developer.

As residents we were sold our properties with the understanding that the land would remain undeveloped and would be farmland in line with the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan. This information was provided through all marketing materials issued, site plans through our solicitors and via all sales representatives that have worked in the marketing suite. To date none of this information has been changed/updated to reflect the proposed 'Phase 2' and is showing this area as 'Farmland'.

The Chairman thanked all speakers and noted that the final speaker, Councillor Giles McNeill, had rescinded his request to speak. The Officer highlighted that, in relation to comments around vehicle access, condition three did ensure vehicle and pedestrian access to the bungalows.

A Member of the Committee commented on the lack of provision of garages however the Legal Advisor highlighted that often housing of this nature did not come with garages and it was not a mandatory element of affordable housing development. In addition, the designs and materials proposed were in line with the existing development.

The Officer recommendation was proposed, followed by a second proposal to refuse the application. This was not seconded.

A Committee Member commented that the site was allocated and the design and materials did match existing developments and so seconded the proposal for the Officer recommendation. On taking the vote, it was agreed that planning permission be **GRANTED**

subject to the conditions as detailed below and that final details of the s106 agreement be delegated to Officers.

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 development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan and Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall indicate measures to mitigate against traffic generation and drainage of the site during the construction stage of the proposed development. The Construction Management Plan and Method Statement shall include;

- phasing of the development to include access construction;
- the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- wheel washing facilities;
- the routes of construction traffic to and from the site including any off site routes for the disposal of excavated material and;
- strategy stating how surface water run off on and from the development will be managed during construction and protection measures for any sustainable drainage features. This should include drawing(s) showing how the drainage systems (permanent or temporary) connect to an outfall (temporary or permanent) during construction.

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

Reason: To ensure that the permitted development is adequately drained without creating or increasing flood risk to land or property adjacent to, or downstream of, the permitted development during construction and to ensure that suitable traffic routes are agreed.

3. No development of plots 29-30 hereby permitted, as depicted on drawing L162-NET-RLP-02 rev.A, shall take place unless planning permission has been subsequently given, to enable vehicular and pedestrian access to connect the dwellings to the public highway.

Reason: Access to these plots is reliant upon planning permission being granted for access across land outside of the application site. It is considered necessary therefore, that no development of the plots take place unless adequate access is secured, in order to accord with policy LP13 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan; and policies D-1, D-2 and H-5 of the Nettleham Neighbourhood 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 details shown on the approved plans:

1501-P-203
L000/2224/A/DS
L000/2324/A/DS
L000/2434/A/DS
L162-NET2-LOCATION-02 Rev B
L162-NET-RLP-02 Rev A

and in any other approved documents forming part of the application.

Reason: To ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the approved plans.

5. No development other than to foundation level shall take place until full details of foul and surface water drainage has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate drainage facilities are provided to serve the development and to prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

6. No development other than foundation level shall take place until details of external finishing materials have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the street scene in accordance with the NPPF and Policies LP17 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and D-6 of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan.

7. Prior to its first use details of the field access track within eastern boundary of the application site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include measures to prevent use by vehicles other than farm vehicles. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

8. Demolition and/or Construction works shall only be carried out between the hours of 07:00 and 19:00 on Mondays to Fridays; and between 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturdays, with no demolition and/or construction works on Sundays and Bank Holidays unless specifically agreed in writing by the local planning authority beforehand.

Reason: To ensure appropriate mitigation for the impact on residential amenity caused by the construction phases of the development and to accord with policy LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan

9. Prior to occupation, a scheme of landscaping including details of the size, species and

position or density of all trees to be planted, fencing and walling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that a landscaping scheme to enhance the development is provided in accordance with policy LP17 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

10. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment dated March 2020 by Millward Consulting Engineers. Any mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property in accordance with policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and policy D-4 of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan

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

11. The bungalows shall be occupied by people aged 55 years and over.

Reason: In recognition of the terms of the planning application and in accordance with Policy LP10 and LP12 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and H3 of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan.

12. None of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be occupied, unless the vehicular and pedestrian access serving it has been completed.

Reason: To ensure adequate access is secured, in order to accord with policy LP13 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan; and policies D-1, D-2 and H-5 of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan.

34 140754 - PLANNING APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF 2NO. ADDITIONAL POULTRY BUILDINGS AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE. LAND OFF GULHAM ROAD, NORTH OWERSBY

The Chairman introduced the next planning application, number 140754 application for erection of 2no. additional poultry buildings and associated infrastructure. Land off Gulham Road, North Owersby. He requested the Officer introduction who stated there was one update to the report for an additional condition to be attached. The previous units had to adhere to a Heavy Goods Vehicle Management Plan and this condition was to ensure any new units also needed to comply with that plan.

The Chairman invited the one registered speaker, Mr Alec Mercer, applicant, to address the Committee.

Mr Mercer stated that the application sought permission to expand existing poultry farming on the land. He explained the business had been operation since 2018. He noted there were no objections from the statutory consultees and the site itself was in a good location in

operation terms. It was in a remote location, well away from neighbours and settlements. He explained that most objections had been regarding the highways impact of the development, however, all commercial vehicles using the site had designated access via the A631. He detailed the route to the site and noted it was deemed to be the least impactful of any possible entry routes. He explained that he had invested over £100k in improvements to the road network which had been in agreement with the Highways Authority. This included passing places, junction improvements and some resurfacing works. Prior to submitting the current application, advice had been sought from the Highways Authority who agreed that the increase in scale of the development was acceptable, subject to the developer agreeing further improvements to the highway, in the form of increased passing places and localised road widening along the route to the site. These further improvements had been agreed. He highlighted that the majority of farming work occurred in rural locations with only single road access, the situation of this enterprise was no different. He addressed other objections received, such as concerns over odours, however they had strict environmental controls in place for odours and other emissions and the site had never received any complaints against them in the time they had been operational. Environmental Health Officers had thoroughly scrutinised the application and offered no objections to the scheme. He requested that the Officer recommendation be followed and for the expansion of the business to be supported.

The Chairman thanked Mr Mercer and, with no further comment from the Officer, invited comments from the Committee Members.

Members of the Committee praised how the developer had worked with highways to alleviate previously raised concerns and noted there had been no complaints raised against the business. A Member commented that it was disturbing to see chickens in sheds such as these, however, having been moved, seconded and with a majority vote it was agreed that planning 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 development shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall:

- be based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development;
- provide details of how run-off will be safely conveyed and attenuated during storms up to and including the 1 in 100 year critical storm event, with an allowance for climate change,

from all hard surfaced areas within the development into the existing local drainage infrastructure and watercourse system without exceeding the run-off rate for the undeveloped site;

- provide attenuation details and discharge rates which shall be restricted to 5 litres per second;
- provide details of the timetable for and any phasing of implementation for the drainage scheme; and provide details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed over the lifetime of the development, including any arrangements for adoption by any public body or Statutory Undertaker and any other arrangements required to secure the operation of the drainage system throughout its lifetime.

No building shall be occupied until the approved scheme has been completed or provided on the site in accordance with the approved phasing. The approved scheme shall be retained and maintained in full, in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the permitted development is adequately drained without creating or increasing flood risk to land or property adjacent to, or downstream of, the permitted development and in accordance with policy LP 14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

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

3. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:

Location Plan IP/MF/02 date March 20; Proposed Site Plan IP/MF/03 date Jan 20; Proposed Elevation and Floor Plans IP/MF/04 date Jan 20

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.

4. Work shall be carried out on the site in accordance with the “recommendation for mitigations and further survey work” of the Ecological Appraisal prepared by Craig Emms and Dr Linda Barnett dated January 2020.

A plan or other information showing the positions of the hedgehog boxes ; bird and bat boxes placed on the site in accordance with part of these recommendations must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing prior to bringing the hereby approved buildings into use.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity in accordance with policy LP 21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

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

5 No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied before the works to improve the public highway by means of a scheme of highway improvements in accordance with Dwg. No. 15382-05, 15382-06A and 15382- 09 have been submitted to, approved and **certified complete** by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision of safe and adequate means of access to the approved development in accordance with policy LP13 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

6. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until an odour and manure management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details agreed shall be implemented in full for the duration of use of the approved poultry units.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring dwellings in accordance with policy LP 26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

7. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied before the Landscaping Scheme shown on plan IPA20826 11A prepared by ACD Environmental dated September 2016 previously submitted on the applicants behalf with the reference 136306 **or** a scheme first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority has been **confirmed in writing as complete** by the Local Planning Authority. 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 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: To ensure that an approved landscaping scheme is implemented in a speedy and diligent way and that initial plant losses are overcome, to ensure that a landscaping scheme to enhance the development and to provide increased opportunities for biodiversity on the site is provided in accordance with Policies LP 21 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

8. The hereby approved units shall be operated in “Compliance with the Code of Good Agricultural Practice for reducing ammonia emissions (Published by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs 2018)”

Reason: As mitigation recommended by Natural England without which the development would damage or destroy the interest features for which Kingerby Beck Meadows and Normanby Meadow Sites of Special Scientific Interest have been notified and in accordance with policy LP 21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

9. The hereby approved units shall be operated in accordance with the Heavy Goods Vehicle Management Plan approved on 28th January 2018 with the reference 136306.

Reason: In the interests of the highway safety and the amenities of neighbouring dwellings in accordance with policies LP13 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

Note: The meeting adjourned at 8:22pm

35 141128 - PLANNING APPLICATION TO DEMOLISH EXISTING MAIN BUILDING AND REPLACE WITH 1NO. DWELLING INCLUDING LANDSCAPING, ANCILLARY WORKS AND INSTALLATION OF SOLAR PANELS TO EXISTING GARAGE. "LAND ADJ", 19 BROOK STREET,HEMSWELL

Note: The meeting reconvened at 8:30pm and a full roll call confirmed all Members present.

The Chairman introduced the next application of the evening, application number 141128 to demolish existing main building and replace with 1no. dwelling including landscaping, ancillary works and installation of solar panels to existing garage on land adjacent to 19 Brook Street, Hemswell. The Development Management Officer explained there had been one further response from the Lincolnshire Bat Group who would endorse the recommendations in section 4.2 of the survey.

The Chairman invited the only registered speaker to address the Committee.

My Andrew Ryley, agent for the applicant, made the following statement.

"I am Andrew Ryley, Director of Planning a DLBP, and I am instructed by the applicant Alan Morris to address you this evening.

I want to start first by saying that Mr Morris is not a property developer. He is now retired, having been an engineer who ran his own business in the north east. Mr Morris and his wife would like to settle down in this area to be near their sons and grandchildren who have moved to Lincolnshire.

Mr Morris bought this property in the knowledge that it had planning permission to be converted into a family dwelling, and this was his intention. But before commissioning builders to start work, he instructed a Structural Engineer to survey the property.

The Structural Engineer's report confirms unequivocally that the building is in a significant state of disrepair and is not structurally sound and capable of being converted. The conclusions of the report are clear that demolition of the existing building is the only option for it.

This conclusion is shared by the Council's own building control officer, Mr Rob Berry, who visited the site earlier this year and inspected the inside of the building. He advised Mr Morris that, and I quote: "the existing building is in a very bad state of repair and the best option for you would be the take it down and rebuild it."

We acknowledge that the Conservation Officer has raised concerns with the demolition of the building. However, it is important to consider that the building is not statutorily listed by Historic England. Rather, it is a non-designated heritage asset and whilst this is still important, it is the lowest level of heritage protection.

The site is in the Hemswell Conservation Area. This does not mean that it is inherently inappropriate to seek to demolish an existing building within it. The key is whether the proposed development, including the replacement building, enhances or preserves the character and appearance of the area.

Preservation does not equate to automatic retention, as one must consider what is proposed in its place. Mr Morris' proposal is for a modest replacement building. It will be smaller in terms of footprint than the consented scheme, and will be lower in height than the adjacent building at 19 Brook Street. The proposal is to use reclaimed Ancaster stone - sourced from the existing building - and heritage clay pan tiles. The new building will enhance the streetscene, especially in the context of the large modern development on the adjacent plot at 17 Brook Street, and also the modern garage that has been built in place of the demolished shoe house.

The 1985 Conservation Area Appraisal identifies the key features of Brook Street as being: "dominated by more natural features including the stud paddocks, the stone property walls, the wide grass verge and the fine trees and hedgerows". Our proposal will not result in any loss or harm to the features that the Appraisal identifies as being important. Rather, the scheme will preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

As you are aware, a neighbourhood plan is being prepared for the area. The Government consistently highlights the importance of neighbourhood planning, with the Planning Practice Guidance saying that: "...such plans can put in place policies that will grant planning permission for the development local people want to see." Policy 8 of the Hemswell Neighbourhood Plan states: "Planning Permission will be supported for the redevelopment - I repeat, redevelopment - of one dwelling on the site." The neighbourhood plan goes on to say that: "The site scored 'Green' in the AECOM site assessment report and was very well received by the local residents during the public consultation events in 2018. 36 out of 36 local residents voted yes to seeing a sympathetic redevelopment and restoration of the site."

In response to the public consultation carried out by the Council for the current application, not one single objection has been made by residents of Hemswell. Rather, the one representation that has been made is from the resident that lives closest and supports the redevelopment proposed. Ward councillor Howitt-Cowan has stated in his consultation response that the decision is a finely balanced one, implying that it is equally appropriate that permission could be refused or be granted.

In our view, the proposed scheme is wholly in accordance with the policies of the development plan in terms of LP4, residential amenity, highway safety, ecology, landscape and sustainability - and that is a position the planning officer agrees with as set out in the report before you - and also we say with the Council's heritage policy. The scheme is planning policy compliant and the neighbourhood plan allocation is a material consideration that weighs strongly in support of the scheme, such that the balance falls firmly in favour of granting permission in our view.

I hope you agree with this contention and grant planning permission this evening. However, we do recognise that this is a professional judgement informed by one's own subjective view on the design of the scheme. Mr Morris has been and remains very open to any suggestions for improvements to the design of the scheme, be it the type of windows, location within the site etc, and so if councillors were minded to defer making a decision to enable those discussions to take place, we would be very happy to undertake such discussions. Thank you."

The Chairman thanked Mr Ryley and enquired if there was any further Officer comment. It

was highlighted that Building Control were not a statutory consultee and did not give planning advice.

Note: Councillor J. Milne stated to the Chairman she had lost internet connection for a period of time and as such would not partake in discussions of the vote.

Members of the Committee sought clarification as to which of the buildings in the shown photographs was to be demolished and there was overall consternation that the building had been left to fall into such a state of disrepair. It was suggested that there could be some level of amendment to the design, for example to retain the front elevation or incorporate elements of the building that were salvageable rather than simply demolishing the entire building. The Officer reiterated that no other alternative had been considered aside from the proposal being considered presently.

A Member of Committee proposed that the application be deferred, in order for further discussions to take place with the applicant to look at what of the existing building could be retained in the new design. This was duly seconded. The Chairman suggested that the decision could be delegated to Officers if such discussions came up with a proposal which could be agreed. That was not to say the application would not return to Committee, but that if there was an agreeable design and proposal it was not required to return to Committee.

With these details clarified and voted upon, it was agreed that the application be **DEFERRED** for further discussion regarding design and retention of the original building [or elements of].

36 139840 - APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS FOR 60NO. DWELLINGS, CONSIDERING APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE, FOLLOWING OUTLINE PERMISSION 136309 GRANTED 12TH DECEMBER 2018. LAND OFF WILLINGHAM ROAD, LEA

The final application of the night was introduced for consideration. Application number 139840 for approval of reserved matters for 60no. dwellings, considering appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, following outline permission 136309 granted 12 December 2018, on land off Willingham Road, Lea. The Senior Development Management Officer explained there had been a request for the application to be referred to the Secretary of State, therefore, any decision the Committee made would be subject to further consideration by the Secretary of State. He also advised the removal draft recommended conditions three and four as these would be covered by conditions on the outline permission. A new condition was additionally recommended following the submission of new information. This recommended condition was:

- The development must be completed in strict accordance with the Precautionary Method of Works document by RammSanderson and the Amphibian Management Plan by RammSanderson including enhancement plan RSE_4126_Figure. All the enhancement measures must be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of protecting and enhancing biodiversity to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP21 of the Central Lincolnshire

Local Plan 2012-2036.

The Chairman invited the first speaker to address the Committee.

Mr Frank Powell, objector, made the following statement.

“Firstly, I would like to thank WLDC for allowing me to address the planning committee. Secondly, in order to provide credence to my statement I am a retired naval officer of some 45 years service, having had command of two submarines. I therefore have considerable experience and knowledge concerning flowing water, pipes and pump capacities.

There are numerous serious issues with this planning application, one of which is the current sewage system and the potential for the developer to connect into it.

The current Lea village sewage system was laid down some 80 to 100 years ago. The southern section which passes beneath my property, the Old Schoolhouse, consists of a 150mm (6 inch) pipe. There are currently 80 homes connected into this pipeline. The pipe is always full to 2/3 capacity by a continuous flow of water which is designed to keep the sewage flowing to avoid blockages. During heavy rainfall the sewage system is overload owing to some of the 80 homes having their surface water diverted to the sewage system.

In 2000, 2012, 2013 & 2014 my property was flooded with sewage. Severn Trent has now bolted down the various manholes on my property to stop further flooding, but this is only a temporary measure. However, the manhole adjacent to my property in Gainsborough Road Lea now lifts and floods the road with sewage during heavy rainfalls. This is a regular occurrence and on 5 occasions during the past 18 months flooded Gainsborough Road Lea with sewage.

The risk assessment report by Severn Trent plc contained the impact advice on conducting development on the proposed site as – sewage flooding, **high risk**, sewage pumping station, **high risk** and the capacity of the sewage treatment works to accommodate sewage flows from additional properties was of serious concern.

The report also stated that capacity improvements are required to accommodate flows from the proposed site. In my experience this would require an update to the complete system, including increased diameter piping from the development site and through the 6 properties that the system passes through and upgraded pumps.

It is my professional opinion that the cost of this upgrade would be beyond the financial capability of the developer and that Severn Trent would have difficulty in financing the upgrade.

In summary, the current sewage system is already overloaded and connection by the developer of an additional 60 homes would be unacceptable, would not meet LP14 flood risk requirements and cause serious sewage flooding and a health and safety issue.

Full planning approval on just this issue should therefore not be approved.

Thank you for your time.”

The second speaker was invited to address the Committee. Mr Robin Heppenstall made the following statement

“Good evening. On 23rd June Lea P.C. wrote to the Planning Officer strongly objecting to this development because it did not comply with the Lea NDP. I support that.

For example, the indicative plan showed 2 bungalows adjacent to my boundary, even then described by the Planning officer as creating a significant loss of amenity.

The present site drawing shows 3 bungalows and 1 house –the mere presence of the house is non-compliant with the NDP – a continuous line of building 45m long against my boundary of 50m, at a closest distance of 6.5m. – **not** 11m as the officer’s report.

The loss will now be considerably more significant, in complete disregard of Policy 1a of the NDP.

The application still lacks a coherent Landscape Management Plan; the present one is described by WL’s Tree and Landscape officer as very poor and unacceptable.

The Officer’s report says that the applicant is creating a more comprehensive document. Frequent reminders over 20 months have failed to produce it, so why should we believe he will produce it now?

This is an area of Great Landscape Value and landscape management is essential; approval should not be given until a real – not a mythical – document is produced and approved by the P C.

Severn-Trent has assessed the sewage system downstream of the site as inadequate needing capacity improvements.

Surely, permission should not be given to connect houses to a known inadequate system with the consequence of discharging raw sewage downstream.

Assurances from ST are not enough; you are all too well aware of changes and cuts to budgets. No approval should be given to this application until the improvement works have actually started.

Paragraph 083 of the NPPF states; where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date neighbourhood plan permission should not usually be granted.

So. Approval

goes against the NPPF

disregards residents’ hard work developing the NP.

creates a precedent that could be used against you by other applicants

I ask you to support the PC’s rejection of the application.”

The Chairman thanked Mr Powell and Mr Heppenstall and invited Councillor J. Milne, Ward Member for Lea to speak.

Councillor Milne made the following statement

“I was against this application the first time and I even more so having read the application before the committee this evening, how can an incomplete be put before the committee for approval?.

From the start Ripon homes have handled the communication with the residents of Lea Village very badly, at the last minute some of the villagers were given a leaflet to advise of a meeting to be held in the village hall (this is the first time as the ward member I was not invited to such an event). Ripon homes were evasive and reluctant to answer questions, no display boards all the cards were in a pile on the table, those residents who are going to be most affected were told Ripon Homes would visit each homeowner, this hasn't happened.

1. There are a number of issues with this application not least Flooding, I am not assured that this problem has been resolved there is not anyway the present sewage and waste water system Will be able to cope, any amount of extra water at the moment causes flooding at the bottom of Lea with sewage overflowing on to the road and into homes. This has not been resolved, and retention ponds will not work. The sewage pumping system is already unable to cope.

We all know the major impact global warming is having on our weather.

2. The properties appear to be quite small with the 4 beds having little parking space, in fact none of the houses have enough space for parking, the entrance and exit from the site comes out opposite another entrance and at the top of an incline, an accident waiting to happen. And definitely not well thought out.

3. The fencing especially which does not do anything to improve to or enhance the look of the village and is inadequate where the pond is, there are not any details about the green spaces trees etc how will these be attended too, what about the great crested newts, when west Lindsey had to do a survey before building the Crematorium 85 great crested newts were found, apparently they have all disappeared according to this survey. LP17 applies Area of Great Landscape value, significant harm will be caused to the church which sits high on the hill and will overlook this site, none of the proposed houses have any distinctive features they are almost the same throughout and less homes are planned but an increase in the size meaning more cars sewage run off surface water nothing like the ones promised, plus more children to an already overflowing school and only 2 doctors surgeries, also what impact will this have on the woods which are an haven for all types of wildlife. This application gives the impression of a piece meal attempt at an housing estate with little thought or care.

4. Lea village plan has not been taken into account.”

Note: Councillor J. Milne stepped down from Committee for the duration of this item.

The Chairman thanked all speakers and invited any comments from the Officer. He noted that it had been conditioned for there to be further information about surface water and foul drainage, capacity and percolation tests. He also confirmed there would be a landscape management plan. The biodiversity plan was still awaited.

A Member of Committee enquired whether the Neighbourhood Plan had been in place at the time the outline application was put forward and this was confirmed to be the case. There was also a question regarding the distance of boundary for No 10 that would be adjacent to

a two storey house and this was confirmed to be 4m out of the 50m boundary line. It was also highlighted that this was a reserved matters application and that the pre-commencement conditions would need to be proven prior to development commencing.

A member of the committee commented on adding an obscure glazing condition for the first floor windows of the two storey dwelling which shared the rear boundary of 10 Willingham Road. The Senior Development Officer advised the committee that a condition of this nature would not be reasonable or necessary therefore would not meet the six conditions test

With no further discussion the Officer recommendation was moved and seconded, and on being voted upon, it was agreed that approval of reserve matters be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions

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

NONE

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:

1. 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:

- 197.24.01 Rev H dated 14th July 2020 – Site Layout Plan
- 197.24.04 Rev E dated 25th June 2020 – Materials Layout
- 194.24.02 Rev F dated 25th June 2020 – Landscaping Plan
- 197.24.35 dated May 2020 – Vehicle Tracking
- 197.24.25 dated January 2019 - Highway Construction Details
- 197.24.34 dated January 2019 – Highway Construction Details (Sheet 2)
- 197.24.27 Rev C dated 25th June 2020 – Kerbing Layout
- 197.24.21 Rev C dated 17th June 2020 – Sewer Layout
- 197.24.20 Rev D dated 25th June 2020 – Highway Layout
- 197.24.26 dated January 2019 – Adoptable Drainage Details
- 197.24.28 dated January 2019 – Outfall Details

Elevation and Floor Plans (unless stated all dated September 2018)

- 197.24.300 – Haselmere (3B14V)
- 197.24.301 – Salisbury (3B16)
- 197.24.302 – Foxton (3D6)
- 197.24.303 – Bakewell (3D7)
- 197.24.304 – Cranmore (3D8)
- 197.24.305 – Romsey (3S27G)
- 197.24.306 – Richmond (4D20)

- 197.24.307 – Richmond (4D20G)
- 197.24.308 – Winsor (4D36G)
- 197.24.309 – Winsor (4D36S)
- 197.24.310 – Woodford (4D44X)
- 197.24.311 – Newton (4D50)
- 197.24.312 dated September 2017 – L2
- 197.24.313 dated September 2014 – L3

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, local policy LP17 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036 and policy 1, policy 3 and policy 4 of the Lea Neighbourhood Plan.

2. No occupation of each individual dwellings must take place until its individual driveway or parking space(s) has been completed in accordance with site layout plan 197.24.01 Rev H dated 14th July 2020 and retained for that use thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway and the safety of the users of the site to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, local policies LP13 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036 and policy 1 of the Lea Neighbourhood Plan.

3. No occupation must take place until details of the type and position (including a plan) of bat boxes has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved must bat boxes must be retained thereafter.

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

4. Apart from bat boxes described in condition 3 of this permission the development must be completed in accordance with all the recommendations set out in the submitted ecological appraisals and great crested newt surveys.

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

5. The development must be completed in accordance with the materials layout plan 197.24.04 Rev E dated 25th June 2020.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the site, the area and the area of great landscape value and to ensure the proposal uses materials and components that have a low environmental impact to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, local policy LP17 and LP26 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036 and policy 1 and 4 of the Lea Neighbourhood Plan.

6. As identified on site 197.24.01 Rev H dated 14th July 2020 dwelling type L2 and L3 must be completed to accord with standard M4(2) of the Building Regulations (access to and

use of buildings) and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To accord with the policy requirement to comply with the 30% M4(2) standard to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP10 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036.

7. Any dwelling with a driveway fronting a garage which has a length of less than 6m will must have a garage with a vertically opening garage door and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure best use of the applicable driveways by ensuring they are not hindered by the opening method of the garage doors to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, local policy LP13 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036 and policy 1 of the Lea Neighbourhood Plan.

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

NONE

37 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS

The outcomes of the recent appeal decisions were noted.

The meeting concluded at 9.34 pm.

Chairman