

## 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 March 2025 commencing at 6.30pm.

**Present:**

- Councillor Matthew Boles (Chairman)
- Councillor Jim Snee (Vice-Chairman)
- Councillor Emma Bailey
- Councillor John Barrett
- Councillor Owen Bierley
- Councillor Karen Carless
- Councillor David Dobbie
- Councillor Ian Fleetwood
- Councillor Peter Morris
- Councillor Roger Patterson
- Councillor Roger Pilgrim
- Councillor Paul Swift

**In Attendance:**

- Sally Grindrod-Smith                      Director Planning, Regeneration & Communities
- Russell Clarkson                              Development Management Team Manager
- George Backovic                              Development Management Team Leader
- Holly Horton                                      Senior Development Management Officer
- Paul Weeks                                        Legal Advisor
- Ele Snow    Senior Democratic and Civic Officer
- Molly Spencer                                    Democratic & Civic Officer

**Also In Attendance:**                      8 members of the public

**Apologies:**                                      Councillor Sabastian Hague  
Councillor Tom Smith

### 191 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

There was no public participation.

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

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 5 February 2025, be confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

### **193 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chairman made a declaration on behalf of all Members of the Committee in relation to agenda item 6d, WL/2025/00005 & WL/2025/00044 – Trinity Art Centre, as the applicant was West Lindsey District Council. He confirmed that Members of the Planning Committee would retain an open mind and determine the application in line with their training. Members were not required to make a further declaration in respect of this application unless they had additional issues to raise regarding their ability to determine the application with an open mind.

Councillor I. Fleetwood declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to application WL/2024/00446 – Land North of Corn Close, Fiskerton. He explained he was the County Councillor for Fiskerton, he had not spoken with Fiskerton Parish Council in relation to this application.

Councillor Barrett declared, in relation to application WL/2024/00570 – Nettleham Road, Scothern, he had received an email regarding the application, but his decision making would not be affected.

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

It was confirmed that the Housing Ministry had announced its Planning and Infrastructure Bill would be published later in the month. Further details regarding the Bill were expected to be provided during the week, although these had not been made available prior to the meeting.

At a local level, it was reported that the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team was continuing its preparation of a design code for Central Lincolnshire. The second stage of consultation was noted to be underway and was scheduled to run for six weeks, concluding on Wednesday 9 April 2025. This stage of consultation was focused on the vision and design principles for the design code. It was further noted that a single survey was to be completed as part of this process, and further details on the design code, including access to the survey, could be found at [Central Lincolnshire Design Code \(Consultation 2\) | West Lindsey District Council](#).

In relation to neighbourhood plans, it was reported that the Reepham Neighbourhood Plan had successfully undergone examination, with the examiner's decision statement having been published. The confirmation of a date for a public referendum was still awaited. It was also noted that the examination of the Dunholme Neighbourhood Plan Review was nearing completion. The examiner had issued their draft report to both West Lindsey and the Parish Council for fact checking purposes only.

### **195 WL/2024/00446 - LAND NORTH OF CORN CLOSE, FISKERTON**

The Officer confirmed that since the deferral of this application, from the Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday 5 February 2025, the applicants had agreed to the contributions required.

The Officer went on to present the site location and its two access points, explaining that the

main vehicle access was situated at the southern end while a secondary access point to the east was designated for cyclists and pedestrians. Concerns regarding site density were addressed, with it being stated that the proposed density was low and could be satisfactorily accommodated on the site. Photographs of the site, including Ferry Road and Hall Lane, were shared to illustrate access points and the surrounding area. It was noted that Hall Lane was unsuitable for vehicle access and was instead deemed appropriate for pedestrian and cycle use.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his presentation and stated that there were three registered speakers; the first speaker, Councillor Walker, as Parish Meeting Representative, was not able to attend, so a statement was read out on his behalf by the Democratic and Civic Officer, as follows.

“With reference to page 25 of the Officer’s report, titled ‘Increase in indicative Capacity’ The final paragraph claims that 75% of the development area is 6.3Ha, this is incorrect. Both the CLLP and the applicants submitted documents state the development area to be 8.13Ha so 75% is only 6.09Ha which at 20dph=122 new homes.

The paragraph then goes on to say that if the total site area was developed then the uplift of housing to 150 could be justified. This is a ludicrous statement to make. Within the development area is an already existing surface water attenuation pond which is a vital section of the existing village flood defence system and under a long-term agreement between the land owner and (I think) WLDC to assure its long-term presence, therefore this area should not be considered or claimed to be a part of, or delivered by the new development, this is approx. 0.67Ha in size.

Later in the officers report it is stated the development will provide approx. 2Ha of open space, so the maximum developable area for this application can only ever be 5.46Ha or the CLLP allocated area minus existing infrastructure minus the allocated open space, which equates to only 67% of the designated 8.13Ha area. Therefore the assumption of 75% being developable is incorrect and completely unachievable. The uplift in housing is therefore neither appropriate nor justified, if anything the housing quantity should be lowered to 109 to match the true development area of 67% of the allocated 8.13Ha site at the recommended density of 20dph.

150 houses on a developable site of 5.46Ha equates to a density of 28dph which according to CLLP document HOU002-a makes this development more akin to a large village or town suburb not a medium village in the Lincolnshire countryside. Para 4.16 of HOU002a goes on to say the assumed figures are a starting point and where more accurate site-specific data exists that it would be used. The explanation above provides site specific data. The site allocation is 8.13Ha, only 67% is developable, at a density 20dph = 109 dwellings therefore this should be the ceiling figure.

It is quite clear a development of 150 dwellings on this site is unsuitable and unjustified and does not meet the guidelines set in the CLLP.

To apply a planning condition to restrict the maximum number of 109 dwellings on this site is appropriate and is supported by site-specific data.

The officers report sets out how this development will provide £94,875 to expand the

Nettleham medical practice and £891,607 to expand the Cherry primary school. This allocation should be revised so that the investment in education is aimed at expanding the Fiskerton school which is within walking distance of the proposed development and the medical improvements should be allocated to improving the Cherry Willingham practice. Getting to the Nettleham medical practice involves a 1 hour bus journey followed by a 20-minute walk whereas the Cherry practice is only 10 minutes on a direct bus route. Both these allocations should be changed so that money generated from a development in Fiskerton is used to directly benefit the residents of that development and the local community.

Sole access via Corn Close for a development of this scale is inappropriate. LCC Highways will say, on paper, Corn Close can handle the extra traffic but in real life, due to the number of parked cars which are always present on Corn Close, it is in effect a single-track road. Consideration should be made on insisting a second access route is created on Hall Lane, which with an appropriate road layout within the new development would split the traffic flow 50/50 between Corn Close and Hall Lane.

A development of this size will take years to complete and will create hundreds if not thousands of HGV movements through the village, to mitigate this an alternative construction access route should be created from the north of the site across the disused Fiskerton airfield, similar to the construction access route provided at the Manor Farm development in Bardney.

Policy S81 of the CLLP sets out a number of site-specific requirements, one of these is a 'Requirement to engage with the local community'. On the 27 February 2024 the applicant held a 4 hour drop in presentation in the village hall, as the Parish Council chairman I attended the full 4 hours of the event. Over the 4 hours the attendance was in the region of 150-200 people, and of them all I didn't speak to anyone or overhear anyone who supported this development.

I had people asking, 'How can they get away with this?' and saying, 'it's too much' and 'in the wrong place'. Engaging the community isn't just holding an event then ignoring what people have said, it cannot be accepted that effective engagement has yet happened and therefore the basic requirements of this application have not been met.

The Parish Council want to work with the landowner and the planning authority to deliver a proportionate and appropriate development within Fiskerton which will build and strengthen our community."

The Chairman thanked the Democratic and Civic Officer for reading the statement and invited the second speaker, Ms Liz Wells, on behalf of the Applicant, to address the Committee.

Ms. Liz Wells introduced herself as the Assistant Director at Deloitte and the agent acting on behalf of the applicant, the Church Commissioners for England, who were identified as the long-term landowners of the site north of Corn Close in Fiskerton. It was explained that the Church Commissioners had been engaging with Officers and the local community over many years to develop options for the site in Fiskerton, with a commitment to ensuring that any development brought forward was sustainable and of a high quality.

It was outlined that the site was allocated in the adopted local plan for residential development, and the application under consideration was an outline application for up to 150 homes, with all matters reserved except for the vehicle access route off Corn Close. Ms. Wells noted that formal engagement on the proposals had included briefings with the Parish Council and Ward Councillors from Cherry Willingham in January and February 2024, as well as a public consultation event held in February 2024. She further highlighted that 18 letters of support for the application had been submitted to West Lindsey District Council and noted there were no objections from statutory consultees, who supported the principle of development at the site.

It was explained that the site was allocated in the most recent local plan of 2023 and had been independently assessed as a sustainable location for housing development in a medium-sized village. The scheme proposed up to 150 dwellings, equating to 18.45 dwellings per hectare. This density was confirmed to comply with Policy S4, which set a target density of 20 dwellings per hectare for a medium village such as Fiskerton. While acknowledging that the number of dwellings proposed exceeded the indicative figure in the local plan, Ms. Wells explained that the proposals were informed by a detailed assessment of onsite constraints and opportunities. She stated that the development struck an appropriate balance, taking into account the site and its wider context.

In terms of housing tenure and affordable homes, it was confirmed that the proposals were compliant and included the policy required number of self-build homes. Ms. Wells explained that all vehicle access would be taken from Corn Close, with the Lincolnshire County Council Highways Authority supporting the submitted transport assessment and its conclusion that the development would have a limited impact on the local highway network. No mitigation measures were required other than a tactile crossing at the junction of Corn Close and Ferry Road, which the applicant was agreeable to delivering. It was also confirmed that Hall Lane was not required for vehicle access but would provide a shared space for pedestrians and cyclists, with a dedicated link to Hall Lane included in the proposals.

All biodiversity net gain (BNG) and open space policy requirements would be met onsite, with the illustrative layout demonstrating that this was achievable. This would be confirmed at the detailed design stage through reserved matters applications. Flood risk and drainage were addressed with a strategy that considered the greenfield runoff rate and included a significant additional allowance for climate change. The technical work had identified the need for two attenuation basins, which were incorporated into the drainage strategy and shown on the indicative master plan.

It was further reported that, following February's Planning Committee, additional discussions had taken place regarding education contributions. Ms. Wells confirmed that full contributions would be made to cover the primary school places generated by the development. A formula would be included in the Section 106 agreement to calculate the required contributions based on the final house numbers, types, and sizes approved at the reserved matters stage.

Ms. Wells concluded by referencing the officer's report, which supported the application and confirmed that the proposals were compliant with and supported the development plan. She expressed confidence that the development would deliver significant benefits to Fiskerton and requested support for a resolution to grant outline planning permission, subject to agreement on the Section 106 and detailed conditions as recommended by officers.

The Chairman thanked Ms Wells for her comments and invited the third speaker, Mr Carl Wager, as Objector, to address the Committee.

Mr Wager introduced himself as a resident of number Five, Corn Close, which he described as being situated at the northern end of the street. He began by expressing his gratitude to the Parish Council for their efforts in conveying the concerns of both objectors and supporters of the development in a balanced and constructive manner. He commended the Council for their time and dedication in producing such a comprehensive and professional contribution to the Officer's report.

Mr. Wager noted that, from the work undertaken by the Parish Council, it was evident that while the majority of residents objected to the development, their objections were primarily focused on the size of the development and the proposal for a single access point via Corn Close. He acknowledged that most residents, including himself and his wife, were not opposed to the concept of growth for the village but could not understand why the scale of the proposed development was so disproportionate to the size of Fiskerton itself. He stated that the proposed increase of 150 houses was contrary to the wishes of most residents, irrespective of their stance on the development. He expressed the view that the proposed scale appeared to prioritise the developers' profits over the wishes of the community, which he argued was fundamentally wrong. He requested that Members consider reducing the scale of the development to a more manageable and harmonious size that would align more closely with the wishes of the local residents.

In addressing the single vehicle access point via Corn Close, Mr. Wager admitted that he and his wife had a personal interest in the matter, as they resided at the top of Corn Close and would be significantly impacted by the construction phase. He expressed concern about the potential upheaval, noise, and disruption that they and their neighbours would face during the initial five-year construction phase, as well as the longer-term effects following completion. While he acknowledged that reports within the Officer's report concluded that Corn Close was adequate for vehicle access, he contended that the statistical analysis did not reflect the reality of living on the street. He stated that he and his wife had reluctantly accepted that Corn Close would serve as the single access point for the development, which he described as their sacrifice for the project.

As a mitigation measure, Mr. Wager requested that the initial construction phase access point be relocated to the old airfield access road on Reepham Road. He explained that this change would alleviate the stress, disruption, and negative impact on residents of Corn Close and their neighbours during the construction phase. He emphasised that the road already existed and suggested that its use would likely involve only a lease agreement or similar arrangement. He maintained that this proposal was reasonable and practical and would result in a more harmonious development process. He further proposed that a construction site compound be located near the old airfield access road to reduce the impact of construction activities on the wider village.

Finally, Mr. Wager called for greater communication and consultation between the developers and those most directly impacted by the development as the process progressed. He requested that efforts be made to engage with residents of Corn Close and others whose properties directly adjoined the proposed development site to ensure that their quality of life, privacy, and right to a peaceful existence were respected. He highlighted the

importance of harmony between the existing residents, the construction team, and the future residents of the development. In concluding his remarks, Mr. Wager stressed the value of avoiding conflict and urged the committee to give due consideration to his requests. Mr. Wager thanked the committee for their time and consideration.

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

The Officer addressed the discussion regarding density and layout, stating that the calculations and the content of the report before members were accurate. It was stated that the proposed development, comprising 150 dwellings, would still represent a low-density scheme on the site.

The Officer acknowledged the concerns raised by residents regarding the use of Corn Close as an access point. It was highlighted that conditions had been imposed requiring the developer to submit further details for approval prior to any development taking place. These details would include the arrangements for construction vehicle access, the proposed hours of operation, and the location of the construction compound. Members were informed that these matters were controlled through the conditions outlined in the report.

In relation to concerns about noise and disturbance, the Officer explained that noise surveys had been undertaken as part of the application process, and predictions were made based on the anticipated traffic movements to and from the development. It was noted that the traffic figures used for these predictions had not been disputed by the Highways Authority. The Officer referred Members to the report, which indicated that while there would be an increase in noise, it would not be significant according to World Health Organisation standards.

The Officer concluded by confirming that conditions were in place to require the developer to submit detailed proposals addressing the location of construction compounds and the routing of traffic during the construction phase, ensuring these matters were appropriately managed.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for the information and opened to Members for debate.

Councillors debated the application with most matters reserved except for access. It was encouraged that the full application should return to the committee for further discussion rather than being delegated to Officers. The primary focus was on road access, with support expressed for a motor access from Hall Lane to ease traffic flow. Concerns were raised about flood management and the need for detailed drainage illustrations. Developer contributions were discussed, with suggestions to allocate funds to the medical practice in Cherry Willingham for easier access for residents. Contributions towards education were also considered, with primary school funding suggested for Fiskerton and secondary education funding for Cherry Willingham.

The drainage strategy was discussed, with detailed calculations showing the site was capable of handling the required attenuation. It was noted that flooding would not occur as a result of the development. Contributions to the NHS and education were clarified to be allocated by the respective authorities, not the Planning Committee. The principle of development was accepted but concerns about Corn Close being the only access road were raised, highlighting potential traffic issues.

A highways note supported the use of Corn Close, and it was shown that a second access from Hall Lane would not significantly reduce traffic. The density of the development was clarified, and it was noted that the Highway Authority had no objections.

During the course of the debate, and in accepting it was an outline planning application, the recommendation contained within the report was moved. Subsequently, a Member of the Committee, in consideration of the access concerns, proposed an amendment that a second access point be afforded to the site from Hall Lane, and that the full application be brought to the Committee. This was confirmed with the proposing Councillor to form part of the motion for decision.

In order to better understand the access concerns, a proposal for a site visit was moved and seconded. On taking the vote and it being an equal split of those in favour and those against, the Chairman used his casting vote, meaning the proposal for a site visit was lost.

With no further speakers indicated, and having a recommendation and amendment proposed and seconded, the Chairman took the vote and it was agreed that outline planning be **GRANTED** subject to the inclusion of an additional condition requiring a second vehicular access off Hall Lane, for the full application be brought back to the Planning Committee, and the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement.

#### **196 WL/2024/00570 - NETTLEHAM ROAD, SCOTHERN**

The Committee considered the application for 49 dwellings on a 2.72 Ha site allocated for residential development. The site, located on the eastern side of Nettleham Road, comprised former cropland with grassland, hedgerows, and small trees. It was bordered by residential areas, green space, and commercial properties.

The proposal included 12 affordable and 37 market dwellings, with a mix of one to five bedroom units. The application had been amended to address concerns from consultees and the Local Planning Authority, with changes to the layout while maintaining the same number of dwellings.

The Officer confirmed that there were no updates for this application. An allocated site under Policy S81 of the local plan was presented. The site was proposed for 49 dwellings as a full planning application. The proposed site plan was shown. The proposed housing mix was presented, indicating that 25% would be affordable housing units. The proposed affordable housing plan was displayed, with affordable houses asterisked on the plan and the access point to the west off Nettleham Road.

Various proposed floor plans and elevations were shown, including different types of dwellings such as bungalows, terrace dwellings, semi-detached houses, and detached houses. Examples of the house types included Deene, Albany, Greenwich, Regent, and Sandringham. The existing and proposed site sections were also displayed.

Photographs of the site were shown, taken on Nettleham Road looking south towards the site. The access point was indicated on the bend in the road. Additional photographs were shown from the opposite direction, with the access point straight ahead. Views from within



the site, including the eastern boundary and southern boundary, were displayed. Further photographs showed existing dwellings forming the Alders and Cade Close. Finally, photographs from the northeast corner looking west and southwest of the site were presented.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for her presentation and invited Mr Mark Foster, who was registered to speak as the applicant, to take his seat.

Mr. Mark Foster, Director of Lindum Homes, addressed the Committee. It was noted that Lindum Homes was a local family-run construction company based in North Hykeham, employing around 600 local employees. The company's commitment to quality was highlighted, referencing their current scheme in Welton. The Welton scheme was nearing completion, and the aim was to continue housing development in West Lindsey with the Scothern site.

The scheme proposed 49 dwellings and had received a recommendation for approval from the Officers. Pre-application public consultation was undertaken with local residents and the Parish Council, and their responses informed the application. Amendments were made in consultation with Officers, statutory consultees, and the Parish Council.

It was emphasised that Scothern had been identified as a sustainable location for development, compliant with both the local plan and the neighbourhood plan. The housing mix included one to five bedroom houses, both market sale and affordable, with 25% affordable housing units. The scheme was designed to be net zero in terms of energy consumption. Residential amenities were considered, with each house exceeding the recommended separation distances. Additional parking was included as requested by Lincolnshire County Council Highways. A 10% biodiversity net gain was achieved, with some contributions required off-site. Drainage proposals included diverting development water southwards into the Anglian Water Network, with an underground storage tank.

The development would contribute to local schools and NHS services, providing around half a million pounds towards local infrastructure. Mr Foster thanked Officers for their support in improving the scheme, which was deemed a quality, policy-compliant development.

The Chairman thanked Mr Foster and as there was no Officer comments, the Chairman turned to Members for comment.

The committee expressed appreciation for the clarity and quality of the plans and photographs presented, noting the improvement from previous years. Concerns were raised regarding the road network and highways issues, particularly the tight junction near the Bottle and Glass pub in Scothern and the frequent accidents at the junction with the A158 and Scothern Lane through Sudbrook. It was suggested that construction traffic should avoid these problematic routes and instead use alternative routes to minimise disruption to local residents.

The Officer confirmed that a construction management plan condition recommended by Lincolnshire County Council Highways included routes for construction traffic and disposal of excavated material. It was agreed that the condition could be made more specific to address the identified issues.

Committee Members commented that the proposed housing density was appropriate for a medium sized rural village, adding sustainability to the community. The developer and Officer team were praised for their work on the application, with the material palette and biodiversity net gain highlighted as positive aspects.

The inclusion of one, two, and three bedroom houses and bungalows was welcomed, addressing the need for downsizing and affordable housing within the district. Concerns about flooding were acknowledged, with the plan to divert water away from the village deemed satisfactory.

The Committee stressed the importance of maintaining riparian responsibilities to mitigate flooding issues and emphasised the positive impact of biodiversity measures, such as hedgehog boxes. The development was considered well-placed and compliant with the neighbourhood plan. The Committee concluded by requesting that construction traffic avoid routes through Nettleham to prevent disruption to the Bill Baileys play area.

Having been proposed and seconded, the Chairman took the vote, and it was agreed that planning permission be **GRANTED**, subject to conditions and an additional informative around construction traffic routing, and the signing of a Section 106 agreement as delegated to Officers.

#### **197 WL/2023/00043 - LAND AT THE CORNER OF NORTH STREET/SPITAL TERRACE**

The Officer introduced the application for up to 20 apartments, noting that the scale and layout were considered before the Committee at this stage. The proposed layout was presented, running around the corner of the junction. The scale showed a standard reduction in height, and 3D visuals were displayed.

It was noted that the site had previously received planning permission for flats and apartments, with the most recent application in 2017. The site, subject to this application, had another application recommended for approval by Officers but was refused by the Committee, leading to an appeal. The appeal was dismissed due to the site's contribution to Gainsborough, being within the conservation area and the setting of nearby listed buildings.

These circumstances were highlighted as considerations for the Committee's determination. Despite the site's allocation for development, Officers were unable to support the application due to these specific circumstances.

A point of information was raised regarding the introduction of the application to WL/2023, noting that it was labelled as 2024 at the top. It was clarified that the target decision date was 29 December 2023. The Officer confirmed that the original determination date was correct and explained that the application had gone through various Officers, resulting in its long-standing status.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his introduction and invited Mr James Hartley, who was registered to speak on behalf of the applicant, to take his seat.

Mr Hartley thanked the Chairman and Councillors and provided an overview of the planning history of the site. It was noted that a planning application for 24 apartments and five shops

was granted in January 2006. A subsequent application for a four-story block of 19 apartments was refused at Officer level in September 2014. Another application for a four-story block of 17 apartments was granted at Committee in April 2016. A change of use application for the land to a park was refused at Committee.

A named Planning Officer had left the authority in May of the previous year, contributing to the delay. By the end of the Officer's involvement, Mr Hartley stated, matters such as biodiversity net gain, highways, flood risk, drainage, and affordable housing had been positively addressed and approved by the Officer and relevant consultees. One public objection was received from the tenant at number one's middle terrace regarding natural light. Two consultee objections were noted, one from the Town Council concerning highways, which was superseded by the Lincolnshire County Council's Highways department's non-objection, and one from the conservation department.

The conservation objection related to the loss of green space and the impact on neighbouring assets, considering the proposal as less than substantial harm under paragraph 208 of the NPPF and policy S57 of the CLLP. This harm must be weighed against public benefits. The Britannia Works Conservation Area Appraisal identified the site as a weak corner and poor open space, emphasizing the need for managed change to retain the special character of the conservation area.

A previous application for a pocket park was refused in January 2021. The last residential application, approved in June 2017, was for 17 apartments in a four-story building. The current proposal included two, three, and four-story elements to mimic and continue the mass of adjoining buildings on North Street and Spital Terrace, reducing the perceived and actual mass compared to the previously approved proposal.

An email was sent to the Conservation Officer for West Lindsey District Council, requesting further correspondence, and an Officer's email from November 2023 was referenced, indicating no immediate concerns in principle. The objection to any form of development on the site was noted as an immediate concern. Mr Hartley expressed willingness to work collaboratively with the Council to achieve a satisfactory outcome, emphasizing that appearance was not a matter for approval at this stage, and that he would be willing to work with the Conservation Officer.

The Chairman thanked Mr Hartley and, noting that there were no comments from the Officers, invited the Committee to begin their discussion.

It was acknowledged that developments within the town had progressed since the 2017 application to develop the corner for housing. The District Council was involved in creating extra green spaces within the town. Concerns were raised about the density of the proposed housing, similar to those expressed in 2017. Although Lincolnshire County Council Highways had not objected, the proximity to the roundabout and pedestrian crossing was noted as a potential issue. The Town Council had provided clear guidance on the matter.

The site was part of the conservation area, and the refusal of the application to develop it as a pocket park had been upheld on appeal. The need for this type of accommodation was evidenced by the Council's housing register. It was also noted that EHSL was not a registered provider, which was important for affordable housing or specialist accommodation.

Concerns were echoed, and the lack of local member input was noted. The site was familiar to some Members, and whilst the building was appreciated for its architecture, it was considered to be in the wrong location.

The application was described as a case of repeated submissions over years without any development taking place. The government's push for housing was acknowledged, but the continuous back and forth of applications was highlighted. The inclusion of one bedroom flats was appreciated, but the refusal was supported due to the appeal and the land's previous grant. It was felt that the opportunity for development on this land had passed.

The building's design was considered unsuitable for the area. It was suggested that the applicant should work with the Conservation Officer to develop a more appropriate proposal.

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 adequately addressed the concerns regarding density and proximity to the roundabout and pedestrian crossing; and insufficient detail had been provided regarding the impact on the conservation area.

### **198 WL/2025/00005 & WL/2025/00044 - TRINITY ARTS CENTRE**

The Officer provided an update, confirming that there were no new developments. The proposal to vary the conditions on the original listed building consent and planning application to rebuild a section of the Trinity Arts Centre wall in Gainsborough was presented. The wall was identified as a curtilage listed wall. The current application aimed to vary several conditions and address previously imposed conditions.

The site plan was displayed, including the secure gravestone storage area as part of the original conditions. The application proposed an adjustment to the extent of the wall required to be underpinned, resulting in more of the original wall being retained. However, the area of walling to be rebuilt would extend by one bay further than the original application. The existing boundary wall and elevation from the previous application were shown, indicating the proposed extent of the rebuild and repair works.

Photographs of the wall were displayed, illustrating the need for repairs to avoid partial collapse. The specific buttresses to be rebuilt were also highlighted.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for their report, and with no registered speakers, looked to Members for debate.

The report was commended, though some difficulties were noted. It was mentioned that a visit to the site had been conducted several months ago, and another Committee had deferred making any judgments. Concerns were raised about the transparency of the process, as a planning application had been submitted without formal approval by any Committee, despite a budget being agreed for the wall.

Sally Grindrod-Smith, the Director for Planning, Regeneration and Communities, was invited to clarify. She explained that the matter would be considered at the next Corporate Policy

and Resources Committee. Officers had been tasked with procuring a compliant solution for the wall, and it became apparent that some changes to the planning approval were required. The planning work was deemed logical to proceed with, to support procurement options, pending the Committee's decision.

Further concerns were expressed about the sequence of actions, suggesting that the planning application might be premature. The importance of addressing the wall's condition to prevent potential hazards was emphasised, and the need to move forward with the repairs was supported.

Questions were raised about the handling of headstones, and it was confirmed that conditions imposed on the original application had been discussed with the Conservation Officer. A secure gravestone storage area was included, and the headstones would be stored and then replaced once the development was completed. It was reiterated that the wall was leaning and could pose a danger.

Having been proposed, seconded, and put to the vote, and it was agreed that planning permission, and listed building consent be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

## **199 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS**

There were no Determination of Appeals to note.

The meeting concluded at 7.56 pm.

Chairman