

## WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, DN21 2NA on 5 February 2025 commencing at 6.30 pm.

**Present:** Councillor Matthew Boles (Chairman)  
Councillor Jim Snee (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor John Barrett  
Councillor Owen Bierley  
Councillor Karen Carless  
Councillor David Dobbie  
Councillor Ian Fleetwood  
Councillor Sabastian Hague  
Councillor Peter Morris  
Councillor Roger Patterson  
Councillor Roger Pilgrim  
Councillor Paul Swift

**In Attendance:**  
Russell Clarkson Development Management Team Manager  
George Backovic Development Management Team Leader  
Holly Horton Senior Development Management Officer  
Danielle Peck Senior Development Management Officer  
Paul Weeks Legal Advisor  
Natalie Smalley Democratic and Civic Officer

**Apologies:** Councillor Emma Bailey  
Councillor Tom Smith

**Also in Attendance:** 16 members of the public  
Councillor Christopher Darcel  
Councillor Stephen Bunney

### 183 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

There was no public participation.

### 184 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 8 January 2025, be confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

## **185 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chairman welcomed the new Members of the Committee, Councillor Roger Pilgrim and Councillor Paul Swift.

Regarding application number 147744, Pallinc Ltd, Beehive Business Park, Church Lane, Rand, the Chairman made a statement on behalf of all Members of the Planning Committee; it was explained that Members had received an email from the Applicant's Agent and the Chairman stated that the email had been deleted without being read.

In reference to application number 147744, Cllr Fleetwood declared a non-pecuniary interest in his capacity as District Councillor for the area. It was stated that he had not been lobbied and therefore would participate fully in the discussion and vote.

With regard to application number 00446, Land North of Corn Close, Fiskerton, Cllr Fleetwood declared a non-pecuniary interest in his capacity as County Councillor for the area. It was stated that he had not been lobbied by the Parish Council, or individuals, and therefore would participate fully in the discussion and vote.

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

The Committee heard from the Development Management Team Manager regarding updates to local and national planning policy. It was explained that a joint statement had been made by the Chancellor and Deputy Prime Minister regarding the acceleration of planning reform to promote growth. The Government had outlined its next steps on planning reform, including reform of the statutory consultee system for planning applications, with a moratorium on any new statutory consultees. The Manager stated that the Government would review existing arrangements to ensure alignment with growth ambitions.

The Planning and Infrastructure Bill, the Manager explained, was planned to be released in spring 2025, and would include measures to expedite the development of infrastructure and homes, and fast-track critical projects such as windfarms, power plants, and major road and rail projects. It was added that a streamlined set of national policies for decision-making was to be introduced to guide local authorities and promote housebuilding in key areas. It was also noted that in a significant growth initiative, the Government would ensure that applications for acceptable schemes in key areas such as high-potential locations near commuter transport hubs would default to approval. The Manager stated that according to the Government, Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) would be replaced with simpler and clearer Environmental Outcome Reports, as introduced in the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act.

The Manager outlined changes locally, explaining that following the planning changes in December, which included the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the national standard method for calculating housing need, a Five Year Supply Interim Update Statement (February 2025) had been produced. It was stated that a 5% buffer was now required to be added to the five-year Housing Land Supply (HLS), resulting in 7.45 years of deliverable supply, above the five-year requirement. It was anticipated that a 20% buffer may be applicable by 1 July 2026, which would be kept under review.

The Manager outlined updates to Neighbourhood Plans in the local area. It was explained that the Reepham Neighbourhood Plan examination had been completed, with the examiner's decision statement published, and a referendum date pending. With regard to the Dunholme Review, it was stated that the examination was currently underway, with a clarification note issued to the Dunholme Parish Council for their consideration and response.

### **187 00446 - LAND NORTH OF CORN CLOSE, FISKERTON**

The Committee gave consideration to the first application on the agenda, application number 00446, seeking outline permission to erect up to 150 dwellings with access to be considered and not reserved for subsequent applications, on land north of Corn Close, Fiskerton.

The Officer gave an update to the Committee by reading out an email from the Applicant. The email addressed the education contribution as considered in the report. It was stated that the Applicant had expressed willingness to agree that an education contribution based on the methodology set out in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) would be followed. However, it was noted that, at this moment, it was not possible to determine the scheme mix with certainty, and therefore, settling on a set figure would be premature. It was requested that delegated authority be given to the Officer to agree on the educational contribution during the drafting of the Section 106 agreement.

The Officer noted that there was a difference of opinion in terms of the required education contributions; the Applicant had agreed to a lower figure, using figures published in the SPD. However, a figure higher by £300,000 had been requested, which had not been agreed by the Applicant.

A Member of the Committee proposed to defer the application until further clarity had been provided regarding education contributions, in order to make a relevant and full judgement. The proposal was seconded, and, on taking the vote it was

**RESOLVED** that the application be deferred until further clarity had been provided regarding education requirements and contributions.

### **188 00662 - LAND AT WILLINGHAM BY STOW FARM, MARTON ROAD, WILLINGHAM BY STOW**

Before the Officer introduced the report, the Committee first heard from the Development Management Team Manager, who highlighted a clarification regarding the application's reported representations. The Manager explained he was aware that written comments made in support of the application, that were in fact attributable to a Mr Martin Snee of Willingham by Stow, had been incorrectly recorded as being a representation made by Councillor Jim Snee of the Planning Committee. The written comments had been erroneously published on the Council's website under Councillor Snee's name. However, it was explained, these comments were not made by Councillor Snee, and the planning team had not received any representations from Councillor Snee regarding the application. The Manager apologised to Councillor Snee, and emphasised that as soon as the error came to light, the website was updated to correctly reflect that the comments were made by a Mr

Martin Snee. It was confirmed that the comments therefore did not amount to any pre-determination on the part of Councillor Snee.

Councillor Snee responded to the Manager's comments. Appreciation was expressed for the clarification and the explanation provided, however, Councillor Snee stated he was disappointed that the issue had not been identified at an earlier date, as notification was only received the previous week. Due to the timelines involved, and to ensure that the application was not influenced by any decision, it was highlighted that he would abstain from taking part in the discussion or vote for application number 00662. It was noted that Councillor Snee would remain in the Chamber to carry out duties as Vice-Chairman, if the Chairman so wished.

Members of the Committee then gave consideration to application number 00662, seeking planning permission for the installation and operation of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) with ancillary infrastructure, landscaping, and biodiversity enhancements, on land at Willingham by Stow Farm, Marton Road, Willingham by Stow.

The Officer explained that two objection addresses had been omitted from the printed report. These objections were from Sandy Bar Cottage, Marton Road, and 23 Saxilby Road, Sturton by Stow. It was added that an additional objection had been received from Green Farm, Willingham by Stow. The objections raised the same issues as the objections summarised in the report, bringing the total number of objections received to nine.

Since the publication of the report, the Officer continued, a consultation response had been received from Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service. They confirmed that, following the Applicant's initial consultation, they were comfortable with the proposed plans and safety measures. It was confirmed that their response was available on the Council's website.

The Officer proceeded to highlight recommended amendments to the printed conditions. In relation to condition one, which pertained to the time to implement the permission condition, the Agent had requested that a five-year time commencement condition be added to the permission instead of the three-year period. It was stated that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) could grant permission for such a period under Section 91.1(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act. The Officer explained that Section 91.2 allowed the authority to grant an alternative period deemed appropriate, considering the provisions of the development plan and any other material considerations. It was noted that the Agent had provided justification for this request, citing an unprecedented increase in connection applications in 2023, with many projects applying for and accepting grid connection offers. The Agent had explained that significant upgrades were required in the existing electricity transmission and distribution system to connect these projects, resulting in long-dated connection dates. The Officer added that the National Grid was implementing grid connection reforms to ensure that Applicants were actively progressing with their proposals. It was explained that two major grid code modifications were expected to become effective by the first quarter of 2025, with revised connection offers to be received by early 2026. Those changes, it was stated, were expected to expedite the required grid infrastructure works and accelerate connection dates for existing projects. The Officer noted that the period of assessment starting in early 2025 would result in a lack of clarity over grid connection dates for the next 12 to 18 months. It was highlighted that for a project of that size, once clarity had been received on the connection date, it would take at least 36 to 48 months to procure equipment, achieve financial closure, and start construction works on site. The Officer confirmed that having

reviewed this information, it was advised to the Committee that the request to allow a longer period to implement the permission was justified, and it was recommended that the five-year time period to implement the permission replace the three-year condition.

Other minor alterations to the proposed conditions were outlined by the Officer. Condition seven, related to highways, was amended to change "no development" to "prior to construction" to allow for any time between the commencement of development and the works to construct the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) itself, ensuring that the condition survey was carried out as close to the time when the majority of the construction traffic would be using the route. Conditions eleven and twelve, it was explained, related to archaeology, were amended to adjust the timescales for submitting the reports from three and six months to within a timescale agreed with the Historic Environment Officer at Lincolnshire County Council, ensuring sufficient time to meet the requirements of the condition. The Officer explained that condition sixteen, related to the biodiversity gain plan, had been amended to include the ecology company's name. An amendment to condition nineteen was explained, which stated that the Battery Energy Storage System and all associated infrastructure must be removed from the site and the site restored to its former state prior to the commencement of development on or before 41 years from the date of operation. The Officer clarified that condition twenty had been amended to state that no later than six months prior to the date of operation, a decommissioning and restoration scheme be submitted to and approved by the LPA. It was explained that all buildings, structures, and associated infrastructure would be removed, and the land restored in accordance with the approved details of the scheme within 12 months following the period of 40 years from the date of operation. The Officer concluded the update by noting that the recommendation to Committee was to grant permission with those amended conditions.

The Officer then presented a short introduction to the planning application, noting that the proposal was for the installation and operation of a 400MW capacity Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). It was noted that the BESS would connect to the Cottam substation, located approximately six kilometres away from the site. The storage system, the Officer explained, would provide a balancing service for electricity from the grid. The Officer outlined a range of features of the proposed site, including visualisations, and a resulting 77.7% biodiversity gain. A cabling route, it was explained, had not yet been submitted, but would be required prior to development.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for her presentation and stated that there were three registered speakers; the first speaker, Councillor Walker, as Parish Meeting Representative, was invited to address the Committee.

Councillor Walker began by stating that Stowe Parish Council was not against the construction of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). It was explained that with large areas of solar panels being sited in the neighbourhood, it was considered logical to have a system that could store the electricity produced by these solar panels. However, the Parish Council's objection was based on the location of the BESS. The Councillor cited the Officer's report, which indicated that BESS sites were usually sited closer to the main power distribution point and that the Applicant had provided sufficient information to justify the siting away from Cottam. Councillor Walker disagreed with this justification, as it was believed that the Applicant had not adequately justified the siting of the BESS so far from Cottam, and on productive agricultural land.

Councillor Walker urged for planning permission to be refused and that the BESS be constructed on a brownfield site closer to Cottam. It was emphasised that the Applicant had conceded many such brownfield sites existed close to Cottam but had rejected them on the basis of cost. The Parish Meeting Representative explained that it was not a sufficient justification for the location. It was also suggested that constructing a BESS on a brownfield site might not be more expensive, as it was stated sizeable grants were now available from the East Midlands Combined Authority to develop the brownfield areas surrounding Cottam. Councillor Walker concluded by reiterating Stowe Parish Council's position, emphasising that the BESS should not be constructed on agricultural land far away from the connection point, and therefore requested that the Committee stood their ground in the face of such developments.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Walker for their comments and invited the second speaker, Ms Julie Barrow, as Agent, to address the Committee.

Ms Barrow explained that she was an Associate Director at Stantec, the planning consultant for the Applicant, FRV Powertek. The Agent noted FRV Powertek's experience in the field, stating that they were a global independent power producer and pioneer in renewable energy generation. It was mentioned that FRV Powertek had been proactively engaging with the LPA and Lincolnshire County Council since February 2024, and the scheme had evolved based on the advice received. Ms Barrow explained that extensive engagement with the local parish council and residents had also been carried out, resulting in several letters of support from residents.

The importance of battery storage in achieving net zero by 2050 was highlighted. It was explained that battery storage systems managed imbalances in the intermittent supply and demand of renewable energy. Without sufficient storage capacity, it was added, energy deficits were balanced through fossil fuels or importing energy from neighbouring countries, which would be expensive and increase carbon emissions. The Agent outlined that when energy supply exceeded demand, the Government paid curtailment costs to turn off generators, which cost over one billion pounds in 2024 and was expected to increase to three billion by 2030, leading to higher energy bills. It was noted that there were several renewable energy projects in the surrounding area, also connecting to the Cottam substation. The Agent explained that although the FRV scheme was not directly related to those projects, it had been designed to complement and support the intermittent generation from those renewable energy schemes.

Ms Barrow outlined that the proposal complied with all relevant planning policies, noting that the BESS footprint covered 3.7 hectares, with the remaining 5.9 hectares dedicated to landscaping and biodiversity enhancement. It was stated that this resulted in a biodiversity net gain of around 78%, above the mandatory requirement of 10%. It was explained that the application was for a temporary period of 40 years, after which the site would be returned to its original state. The Agent stated that with regard to construction traffic, the proposed development would be accessed via Marton Road immediately to the north of the site. It was added that the highways authority had raised no objections on safety grounds. Ms Barrow explained that FRV was committed to constructing three passing places along Marton Road and would carry out a highway condition survey prior to construction, then repair and maintain Marton Road at their own cost.

It was confirmed that cumulative impacts had been assessed with the consented NSIP

projects. The Agent concluded that as different traffic routes were proposed, there would be no significant cumulative impacts, which was confirmed by the highway authority. Ms Barrow stated that the cumulative visual impacts of the scheme in conjunction with the Gate Burton project were considered to range from small to negligible in magnitude. In relation to fire safety, it was explained, FRV had engaged with the Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service; the Fire and Rescue Service confirmed that the proposal accorded with guidance in terms of access, water supply, spacing, and design, and they had no objection to the application.

Ms Barrow detailed the drainage strategy, including measures to prevent the infiltration of any potentially contaminated water. This included the provision of an impermeable storage basin that would allow for water runoff to be contained, tested, and disposed of safely as required.

In conclusion, the Agent stated that the proposal was supported by national and local planning policy. It was noted that there were no objections on technical or cumulative grounds from any of the statutory consultees. Finally, Ms Barrow reiterated the benefits of the scheme noting that it weighed heavily in favour of approval.

The Chairman thanked Ms Barrow for her comments and explained that the third speaker, Cllr Mullally, Ward Member, had submitted a statement to be read on her behalf.

The Democratic and Civic Officer explained that Councillor Mullally was unable to attend the meeting as she was attending a flooding meeting in Sturton-by-Stow. The following statement was read aloud.

“FAO Chair

My name is Lynda Mullally, and I am the locally elected District Councillor for Stow Ward in West Lindsey, Lincolnshire.

I am writing to offer my observations and indeed shared concerns in respect of the proposed BESS development at Willingham by Stow Farm, Marton.

May I state that my concerns and observations are based largely on overwhelmingly negative local feedback, and I refer the committee to the representations offered by Miss Clare Ella (accessible via the comments section of the WLDC planning portal) as a well-researched, dispassionate, clear, and above all contemporary example of reservations held by a significant number of residents, alongside visitors who use this area for recreational purposes. The concerns and observations outlined within Miss Ella’s letter paint a concerning picture of a poorly researched project that may potentially be more focused on profit than progress but is at best ill-advised and inaccurate. It is certainly not a project focused on enhancement of the local environment or quality of life for the traditional inhabitants of this peaceful and rural community.

If any portion of this process is to consider legacy, then surely the removal of its agricultural identity must be of central concern. The scaled representations submitted by the applicant do not convey the reality of impact - that will fundamentally reposition the development site as an industrial landscape and not a rural one. The BESS proposals will change the physical appearance and functionality as a rural habitat for wildlife that has implications beyond the immediate locality. On this point it is contended that documents provided to date, including

reproductions of drawings, provide merely an outline with questionable accuracy and fail to adequately illustrate the full impact either now or in the future. I strongly advocate a site visit by the planning committee. Such a site visit should consider the potentially destructive threat presented by this project, and of further similar development if this initial poorly planned proposal is allowed to proceed. On this point I again refer you to Miss Ella's submission and a widely held belief that the impact is vastly understated, with assertions made by the applicant and its consultants seemingly based on anecdotal, office-based, desk-top investigation rather than actual first-hand knowledge which would be evident in even the most rudimentary local conversation. This concern is self-evidenced by the applicant in their documents in support - basic errors of misspelt locations (Gate Barton) and understated estimates of vehicular impact. Such disregard for accuracy undermines confidence in the motives and efficacy of a project which, if allowed to proceed, is likely to reshape whole communities of people and wildlife alike, as it will open the floodgates to similar applications along the corridor of the cables between the already approved NSIP solar farms and the National Grid connections at Cottam and West Burton

I also draw your attention to consideration of Health and Safety fears in relation to vehicular activity both during construction and after completion. Given the poor maintenance of local highways are we to believe that there will be no impact on already overburdened road surfaces and vulnerable verges thereby endangering motorists, pedestrians, and wildlife alike. Furthermore, many of my constituents are understandably worried about the increased possibility of electrical fire and the plans not only for dealing with such unprecedented incidents but also the disposal of contaminated material including batteries and water.

In conclusion, I wish to make it clear to the planning committee that whilst I and my constituents agree that considerations of renewable energy solutions are of key importance to us all, they cannot be allowed to automatically trump the wider negative impact of planning decisions that are within our remit. The value of our local community identity and the health of our residents, flora and fauna cannot be disregarded in favour of ill-conceived and possible short-term remedies that strive to tick boxes on the Net Zero agenda. I therefore, in the first instance call on you to undertake a site visit to scrutinize the veracity of plans presented by the applicant, and in any event to take heed of the overwhelming number of valid concerns raised by those opposing the proposals before you.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my submission.  
Lynda Mullally"

The Chairman thanked the speakers and sought a response from Officers.

The Manager reminded the Committee that the focus of the discussion was on land use planning decisions and the determination of whether the BESS was acceptable in the proposed location. It was stated that regarding national policy, applicants were not required to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy, as it was considered a given. The Manager noted that significant weight should be given to the benefits associated with renewable and low carbon energy generation, as well as the proposal's contributions. The key implication of the move towards low carbon energy, it was explained, would be the increasing demand for electricity. The Manager outlined the position of local policy, and stated that demand for electrical energy was forecast to increase by 165% in central Lincolnshire over the next 30 years. It was highlighted that as a result, the infrastructure around energy, particularly electrical infrastructure, would need to adapt and change to



accommodate the increased need for the management and storage of electricity. It was explained that support would be given to proposals necessary for or forming part of the transition to a net zero carbon sub-region, which could include energy storage facilities. However, any such proposal should take all reasonable opportunities to mitigate any harm arising and select appropriate locations and design solutions to minimise harm.

The Manager continued, adding that the site in question was a 3.7-hectare development within a 9.6-hectare area, with the remainder dedicated to biodiversity net gain. It was noted that the site was outside of what was classified as best and most versatile agricultural land. It was explained that site-specific testing had confirmed that the land was classified as 3B. The Manager highlighted that the requirement about food production was removed from the National Planning Policy Framework in December 2024, and a new land strategy was expected.

Cllr Fleetwood made a non-pecuniary declaration regarding application number 00662, land at Willingham by Stow Farm, Marton Road, Willingham by Stow. It was stated that he had substantial shareholding in National Grid but believed it did not preclude him taking part in the debate or the vote, as the Applicant was a separate company.

Members expressed concern about the location of the proposed site, noting the site would be located in open countryside, with a six-kilometre underground cable attached as necessary to connect the BESS to Cottam. A preference was expressed for the site to be located closer to its connection point to address issues such as energy loss due to the length of the cable. Members of the Committee suggested that the BESS would be more appropriate located on an industrial site. The agricultural land in question was noted as being used for growing food, and Members expressed the view that the development was inappropriate for the area, given the existence of brownfield sites closer to the connection point.

Concern was raised regarding the amended condition, which would extend the required start time of the project from three to five years. The justification for extending the period was understood, but there was a desire for oversight and control over the location of such sites to avoid losing valuable land to industrial use. Members were informed that this condition could be reduced from five to three years at the Committee's discretion.

A Member of the Committee proposed to refuse the application based on a lack of justification for the location of the development, referencing policies S5 and S16 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP). This was duly seconded. The Manager clarified that local policy supported rural locations if they maintained or enhanced the rural economy, or were justified by proximity to existing businesses or natural features. Policy S16, the Manager continued, also required that all reasonable opportunities to mitigate harm and select appropriate locations be taken.

The Committee was reminded to apply significant weight to the benefits versus harm in their decision-making. The Manager advised the Committee that the test was to determine why the development should not be located at the proposed site, focusing on articulating the significant harm that outweighs the benefits.

Members of the Committee responded by raising concerns about the appropriateness of the location due to the current inability to connect to the grid. It was suggested that the location

might be appropriate in the future if the grid was updated, but currently, it was deemed inappropriate. The Officer confirmed that the Applicant had a connection agreement with National Grid, ensuring the deliverability of the scheme. A technical note from National Grid had been provided to support this.

In response to a question regarding the current use of the proposed site, the Officer stated that the land was still in use as farmland.

The discussion was brought to a conclusion, with reasons for refusing the application summarised. It was stated that the application had not demonstrated that it would be an appropriate location for such a facility, which would take place on land in active agricultural use, some considerable distance from the grid point of connection (POC). The application had not adequately demonstrated why the site had been selected in preference to previously developed land, or in preference to sites closer to the POC. Members outlined that the application had provided insufficient details regarding the means of connection; or to demonstrate that the project would be deliverable within a reasonable timescale. It was explained that the development was considered to be contrary to the provisions of the CLLP (2023), in particular, policies S5 (Part E) and S16.

On taking the vote, it was agreed that planning permission be **REFUSED** on the basis that the application had not demonstrated the appropriateness of the location; it had not demonstrated a reasonable timescale for delivery; insufficient detail had been provided regarding means of connection; and the development was considered contrary to policies S5 and S16 of the CLLP (2023).

#### **189 147744 - PALLINC LTD, BEEHIVE BUSINESS PARK, CHURCH LANE, RAND**

The Committee gave consideration to the final application on the agenda, application number 147744, seeking the expansion of existing business premises to provide a new car park, and pallet production building, at Beehive Business Park, Church Lane, Rand. The Officer introduced the application and provided an update regarding page 128 on the report pack, which referenced the door of workshop one. It was clarified that the door would serve a storage area only and would not be in operational use, thus there was no need for it to be conditioned as closed. No changes to the proposed conditions resulted from the update.

The Officer continued, showcasing the location and features of the proposed development using plans and photographs. The site plan was displayed, highlighting the existing workshop building to the west, the proposed extension to the south, and the proposed hard-standing lorry park area in the middle. It was noted that the proposed ground floor plan indicated a single-story development with a pallet sorting system. The Officer explained that a lighting scheme had been submitted with the application, and an indication of this was provided. Noise scenarios had also been submitted, the Officer stated, and outlined the expected noise differences between the existing site and the proposed site. The Officer concluded, stating that Lincolnshire County Council Highways had requested a specific section of Rand Lane to be widened as a planning condition.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for her presentation and stated that there was one registered speaker; Mr Waring, Applicant, who was invited to address the Committee.

Mr Waring explained that he was one of the owners of Pallinc as well as other local businesses based at Rand Farm Park. It was noted that their enterprises in Rand provided 300 jobs and contributed positively to the district. The application, the Applicant explained, was part of the journey to develop Pallinc as a sustainable, conscientious, and sympathetic business, acknowledging the sensitivity of the rural setting and environmental impact. Pallinc was identified as the largest company in the UK refurbishing wooden pallets entirely from recycled materials, with monthly pallet volumes exceeding 200,000 units since starting in 2015. After reviewing the Officer's report, Mr Waring highlighted a willingness to work with the Council to address third-party comments, taking steps to recognise and mitigate material impacts. It was stated that there were no objections from statutory consultees and multiple comments in support of the application. Mr Waring welcomed the findings of the report, and the recommendation of approval was supported.

The Applicant sought to reassure the Committee and objectors regarding the efforts taken to address concerns of noise egress and traffic on Rand Lane. Mr Waring stated that their operations would not have an unacceptable impact on noise levels, and mitigation measures had been implemented, included modifying workbenches to absorb sound, retrofitting white noise sounders on forklifts, and renting alternative space on site for vehicle storage away from neighbours. It was added that the Council's Environmental Protection team investigated noise levels at the existing site and found no measurable nuisance warranting further action.

The Applicant emphasised the importance of addressing traffic concerns through extensive technical work, which had demonstrated no unacceptable negative impact. The Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency (DVSA) and Vehicle and Operator Services Agency (VOSA) had approved the site, it was explained, for the operation of up to 20 Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) and 65 trailers. However, it was noted that the proposition of condition eight, stipulating full responsibility for local road widening on a single operator, he believed was neither fair nor reasonable. Mr Waring added that planning permission would not permit the operation of additional vehicles beyond those already licensed, therefore, the anticipated increase in vehicle movements was a consequence of expanding operations due to the growth of their business, as well as the growth of other businesses on site. The Applicant continued, stating that the proposed development aimed to improve the flow into and out of the site, enhancing the impact on local roads.

Mr Waring continued, explaining that Rand Lane served multiple businesses and organisations, in addition to farm and residential traffic. The Applicant stated that Pallinc's impact on road degradation was marginal, as their 20 HGVs represented fewer than half of the registered HGVs in Rand, with many of the other registered HGVs being heavier and more powerful vehicles. According to the Applicant, a further transport study had indicated sufficient passing places and visibility to accommodate the anticipated traffic, without the need for road widening, and without causing an unacceptable adverse impact. Mr Waring added that the Highways Authority previously recommended road widening on Rand Lane, including for another application, yet no condition was imposed by the Council at the time. The Applicant noted that the stretch of the lane in question offered limited opportunity for widening, requiring the removal of trees on the west side of the lane, which belonged to private property and therefore not under Council nor Applicant control. The Applicant concluded by stating that the current arrangement of multiple passing places on a single-track road was deemed sufficient, and the Committee was asked to consider the removal of condition eight if the application was granted.

Members expressed their support for the application, noting the significant growth of Rand from a small settlement to a major employment site for several businesses. Members of the Committee reiterated the Applicant's concerns regarding condition eight, notably, that the Applicant would not have access to neighbouring properties in order to widen the road. Questions were raised about the Applicant's sole responsibility to widen the road, despite the significant frequency of traffic from other road users. A proposal was made to grant planning permission as outlined in the Officer's recommendation, however, with the amendment of removing condition eight.

The Officer added that there would be an increase in vehicle movements associated with the proposed development, totalling 268 per day, with 37 being HGVs. Members reiterated that the number of HGVs registered to the site would remain the same, and the Officer confirmed that the increase in vehicle movements would be due to business operations and additional employees.

The Committee expressed support for the application, emphasising that the expansion would create more jobs without increasing the number of lorries, and highlighted the importance of job creation in rural areas.

In response to a question about noise levels, the Officer confirmed that recent noise monitoring did not identify any statutory nuisance.

Having been proposed and seconded, with the amendment to remove condition eight noted, the Chairman took the vote, and it was agreed that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to completion of a S106 agreement to secure biodiversity net gain, and 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:**

None.

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

2. The Biodiversity Gain Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric received 11/09//2024 and prepared by Max Cheesman from Three Shire Ltd.

**Reason:** To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Policy S61 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

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 and materials:

- Location Plan: 0740-AM2-GP01 received 02/12/2024
- Proposed Site Plan: 0740-AM2-PSP01 received 02/12/2024.
- Proposed Site Plan - Enlarged: 0740-AM2-PSP02 received 02/12/2024.
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan: 0740-AM2-PGF received 02/12/2024.
- Proposed South and East Elevations: 0740-AM2-PE02 received 02/12/2024.
- Proposed North and West Elevations: 0740-AM2-PE01 received 02/12/2024.
- Proposed Roof Plan: 0740-AM2-PRP received 02/12/2024.

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 and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy S53 and S57 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

4. The development hereby approved must only be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out in section 4.0 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated December 2023 completed by Three Shires Ltd.

**Reason:** To ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the approved management plan and to protect the habitats and wildlife on site to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and S60 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

5. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accordance with the details set out in the submitted Energy Statement received 02/12/2024, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with the provisions of Policies S6 and S7 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

6. Prior to occupation of the building, a written verification statement shall be submitted to demonstrate that the approved scheme has been implemented in full, in accordance with the submitted Energy Statement received 02/12/2024, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with the provisions of Policies S6 and S7 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

7. New hardstanding shall be constructed from a porous material or shall be demonstrably drained within the site in accordance with the surface water drainage scheme required under condition 9, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

**Reason:** To ensure appropriate drainage to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy S21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

9. The permitted development shall be undertaken in accordance with a surface water drainage scheme which shall first have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall:

- be based on the results of evidenced groundwater levels and seasonal variations (e.g. via relevant groundwater records or on-site monitoring in wells, ideally over a 12-month period);
- be based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development;
- provide flood exceedance routing for storm event greater than 1 in 100 year;
- 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 greenfield run off rates;
- 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 part of the development 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, or upstream of, the permitted development, to accord with Policy S21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, and the provisions of the NPPF.

10. No operations associated with the new development as approved within this permission must occur until the car parking area identified on site plan 0740-AM2-PSP01 received 01/12/2024 has been fully completed and retained for that use thereafter.

**Reason:** To ensure safe access to the site and in the interests of highway safety to accord with Policy S47 and S49 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. The development hereby approved must only be carried out in accordance with the Lighting Scheme dated 20/01/2025 and the Lighting Specification dated 20/01/2025, and must be retained as such thereafter. No additional external lighting shall be provided within the site unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To protect the amenity of the adjacent neighbour's from undue light pollution to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

12.The development hereby approved must only be carried out in accordance with the roller shutter door specification as outlined on 'Eurospeed Brochure' received 02/12/2024, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The doors must be installed prior to operation of the proposed portal frame building in the locations shown on drawing 'Proposed Roller Shutter Door Locations' received 02/12/2024, and must be retained as such thereafter.

**Reason:** To protect the amenity of the adjacent neighbour's from undue noise to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

13.The development hereby approved must only be carried out in accordance with the Noise Impact Assessment Technical Report 41357-R2 dated 08/11/2024 completed by soundsolution consultants.

**Reason:** To protect the amenity of the adjacent neighbour's from undue noise to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

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

14. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no oil tanks or gas tanks shall be placed within the curtilage of the building hereby approved.

**Reason:** In the interests of energy efficiency to accord with policies S6 and S7 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

15. All pallets that are stacked within the red line boundary of the site as identified on Location Plan: 0740-AM2-GP01 received 02/12/2024 shall be stacked no higher than 5 metres from ground level.

**Reason:** In the interests of visual amenity to accord with Policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**190 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS**

There were no Determination of Appeals to note.

The meeting concluded at 7.50 pm.

Chairman