

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall on 25 June 2025 commencing at 6.30 pm.

Present:

| |
|--|
| Councillor Matthew Boles (Chairman) |
| Councillor Ian Fleetwood (Vice-Chairman) |
| Councillor John Barrett |
| Councillor Karen Carless |
| Councillor David Dobbie |
| Councillor Tom Smith |
| Councillor Jim Snee |
| Councillor Paul Swift |

In Attendance:

| | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Russell Clarkson | Development Management Team Manager |
| Ian Elliott | Development Management Team Leader |
| Danielle Peck | Senior Development Management Officer |
| Paul Weeks | Legal Advisor |
| Ele Snow | Senior Democratic and Civic Officer |
| Molly Spencer | Democratic & Civic Officer |

Apologies: Councillor Trevor Bridgwood

Also in Attendance: 34 members of the public

8 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

There was no public participation.

9 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Having been proposed and seconded, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 28 May 2025, be confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Dobbie declared a non-pecuniary interest regarding planning applications WL/2025/00326 and WL/2025/00431. He noted that both applications had previously been considered by Gainsborough Town Council, of which he was a Member. He confirmed he would assess the applications based solely on the information presented at the meeting and take part in the discussion and vote.

11 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT/LOCAL CHANGES IN PLANNING POLICY

An update was provided following the previous month's announcement concerning measures to accelerate build-out rates for consented sites. It was reported that the Government had begun consulting on changes to biodiversity net gain regulations, with a key proposal to exempt small sites of fewer than ten dwellings. Currently, only self-build developments were exempt. Consideration was also being given to introducing a new category for medium-sized developments, defined as those comprising between 10 and 49 dwellings, which might be subject to separate rules.

At the local level, it was confirmed that the Reepham Neighbourhood Plan referendum was scheduled for the following day. The Dunholme referendum had been arranged for 24 July 2025. The Ingham Neighbourhood Plan had been submitted to West Lindsey District Council and was expected to enter consultation shortly. The Saxilby with Ingleby review was undergoing consultation until 22 August 2025. The Grasby and Grasby and Searby cum Owmbly plan was at the Regulation 14 stage, with consultation running until 6 July 2025, after which formal submission would follow.

12 145475 (WL/2024/00015) - LAND AT WOODCOCK LANE, BURTON WATERS

The Committee gave consideration to application number 145475 (WL/2024/00015) seeking approval for permissions to erect 66no. residential dwellings together with associated access, parking and landscaping.

The Officer provided an update to the Committee, confirming that correspondence had been received from Sir Edward Leigh MP in support of objections raised by the occupants of 20 Bay Willow Road, Burton Waters. It was reported that negotiations regarding the viability clause remained ongoing with the applicant. The Officer advised that, should agreement on the clause wording not be reached, the application would be returned to the Committee with revised wording for consideration.

The Officer's presentation continued, outlining the application for 66 dwellings, access roads, parking, and associated landscaping on land to the south-west of Woodcock Lane, Burton Waters. It was confirmed that the site formed part of an allocation within the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and that extant permission existed for 18 blocks of terraced properties, which constituted the fallback position.

It was explained that a Lawful Development Certificate had been granted on the basis that a material start had been made and that the dwellings could be classed as C3 dwelling houses, due to the absence of conditions or legal agreements to secure the dwellings as a C2 use. The proposed site layout was presented, including open space, a small woodland area to the north, and a one and a half metre landscape buffer along Woodcock Lane. Site levels, street scenes, floor plans, and elevations were also shown, along with photographs illustrating the site context and surrounding area.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for her presentation and stated there were six registered speakers for this application; the first speaker, Councillor Sue North, as Chairman of Burton-by-Lincoln Parish Council was invited to address the Committee.

Councillor Sue North, the Chair of Burton Parish Council stated that when the original concept for Burton Waters had been proposed, the then Parish Council had objected to the development, although support had been expressed for elements such as single storey lodges, assisted housing, and the inclusion of a nature reserve.

Reference was made to the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, in which the parcel of land in question had been allocated for approximately one hundred units of extra care housing. It was asserted that this allocation remained in place. Concern was raised that Burton Waters, classified as a medium village, would typically accommodate growth of up to ten dwellings, whereas the current application proposed 66 dwellings with no provision for assisted living. It was stated that the scale and nature of the proposal were at odds with the existing community, which was characterised by over-50's living and single storey properties.

Councillor North emphasised that the Parish was not opposed to development in principle but considered the current proposal to be unsuitable and non-compliant with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. It was noted that Burton Waters fell within Zone Value B for affordable housing, which required a twenty percent provision, yet none had been proposed.

Concerns were also raised regarding the existing drainage system, which was reported to be problematic, with regular visits from tankers required to address blockages and assist water flow. It was stated that this issue should be resolved prior to any further development.

Further objections were expressed in relation to the proposed number of vehicles, with over two hundred parking spaces included in the application. It was suggested that the nearby A57 roundabout already experienced significant congestion, which would be exacerbated by the development.

The speaker urged Members of the Committee to visit the site to observe the contrast between the proposed development and the existing community, which included Burton Waters Lodges, Lakeshore, and The View – all described as single-storey, low-density, age-restricted homes set in a lakeside or woodland parkland setting. It was stated that the proposed development was the opposite of this character.

The speaker concluded by requesting that a decision be deferred until a site visit had been undertaken and the objections submitted via the West Lindsey planning portal had been reviewed.

The Chairman thanked Councillor North for her comments, and invited the second speaker, Mr David Barker, as Agent to take his seat.

Mr Barker addressed the Committee, stating that the proposal was the result of over two years of work with a range of stakeholders. It was explained that the application had evolved through careful consideration and in response to advice from planning officers and consultees. The site was confirmed to be allocated for development in the Local Plan and to benefit from extant planning permission for one hundred market homes, including a significant proportion of two-storey buildings.

It was stated that the landowner had held land in this part of Burton Waters for twenty-two years, with the intention of delivering a high-quality development and completing the settlement. The speaker noted that extra care housing was not viable on the site due to the

presence of an existing care home at Burton Waters. The current proposal for 66 homes was described as a lower-density alternative to the extant scheme, offering reduced traffic, increased landscaping, larger plots, and more generous gardens. These features were said to enhance residential amenity, support biodiversity, and provide additional open space along the Fosdyke.

Mr Barker confirmed that no objections had been received from statutory consultees, including the Highways Agency, Environment Agency, Drainage Officers, Education Authority, NHS, Wildlife Trust, Canal and River Trust, County Archaeology, Environmental Health, Strategic Housing, Tree and Landscape Officer, Anglian Water, Police, or Fire and Rescue Service. It was acknowledged that some residents preferred the site to remain undeveloped or to be developed differently, but it was emphasised that this part of Burton Waters had remained incomplete for many years.

Mr Barker stated that approval of the application would facilitate the completion of Woodcock Lane and the nature reserve to the north of Burton Waters. Reference was made to national housing targets and the importance of delivering allocated sites. It was noted that Ripon Homes, the intended developer, was no longer trading, but that Quintor would seek another local builder to deliver the scheme.

The proposal was said to include a £41,000 NHS contribution and to offer affordable housing if the viability of the scheme improved. Public open space would be provided, and the scheme was described as offering improved energy efficiency, electric vehicle charging points, and thirty percent M42-compliant homes. Flood risk would be addressed through ground level adjustments, supported by the Environment Agency and local flood authorities. Biodiversity gain would be delivered, including the use of hedges in place of walls and ecological monitoring during construction.

Mr Barker concluded by stating that the proposal complied with planning policy, offered significant benefits over the extant scheme, and represented the best opportunity to complete this part of Burton Waters. Support for the application was requested.

The Chairman thanked Mr Barker for his comments and confirmed that three objectors had registered to speak. It was noted that all three had agreed for the first registered speaker, Mr Anderson, to speak on their behalf for the full five-minute allocation. Mr Anderson was then invited to take his seat.

Mr Anderson began by thanking the Chairman and Committee for the opportunity to speak. He stated that he was speaking on behalf of the Burton Waters Management Company, the Burton Waters Residents Group, the recognised Tenants Association, and, he believed, the majority of the audience present. He introduced himself as a chartered town planner and chartered surveyor specialising in development.

He clarified that the community was not opposed to development, but wished to see the right type of development brought forward. He expressed concern that the application demonstrated little regard for the principles of community and placemaking upon which Burton Waters had been established. Reference was made to several policies of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, including Policy S4, Policy S81, Policy S22, and Policy S53, which were cited in relation to the principle of development, lack of affordable housing, and the design's adverse impact on local character.

Mr Anderson stated that the site was allocated for one hundred extra care dwellings, not private housing. While acknowledging the extant permission and the Lawful Development Certificate issued in 2019, he emphasised that the current application should be assessed on its own merits. He noted that the original intention for the site had included extra care housing, park homes, a visitor centre, and a nature reserve, all of which were considered more appropriate for the character of Burton Waters.

Concerns were raised regarding the viability of the scheme, particularly in light of the insolvency of Rippon Homes, the intended developer. Mr Anderson questioned whether the scheme could be delivered and suggested that it might serve only as a gateway to a future, undefined proposal. He criticised the absence of any affordable housing contribution and noted that the site's allocation for one hundred units meant the current proposal would reduce the housing supply by thirty-four units.

In terms of design and scale, Mr Anderson argued that the proposed estate-style housing was incongruous with the existing settlement, which was characterised by low-density, single-storey park homes and lodges. He noted that the extant permission had included single-storey dwellings along the eastern edge, whereas the current proposal introduced two-storey dwellings in that location, which he believed would adversely affect the amenity of existing residents.

He further highlighted concerns regarding the unadopted status of Woodcock Lane and the increased pressure the development would place on it. He concluded by urging the Committee to either refuse the application or defer it to allow Members to undertake a site visit and assess the context in person. He reiterated that the community supported appropriate development but believed this proposal did not meet that standard.

The Chairman thanked Mr Anderson for his comments and explained that there had been two registrations to speak in the Ward Member capacity so the time would also be shared.

Councillor Brockway began by expressing support for the calls for a site visit. She stated that there were inaccuracies in the information presented to the Committee, particularly the claim that the proposed development would not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. She disagreed, noting that the area was a retirement community comprising three retirement developments and a care home at the entrance to the road. She emphasised that it was a child-free area and that this was a key concern.

While supporting the points raised by previous speakers, Councillor Brockway highlighted what she considered to be a serious safety issue. She explained that there were no social or educational facilities in the area for families or children, and that there was no school within safe walking distance. The A57 was described as lacking footpaths for much of its length, making it unsafe for children to walk or cycle to school. She expressed doubt that any parent would consider the route safe for primary-aged children.

She further stated that, despite being informed there was no objection from the education authority, a local school had confirmed that no one had contacted them regarding capacity. She considered this a significant oversight. Concerns were also raised about the presence of two-storey houses in a community of bungalows, which she believed would be out of keeping with the area and likely to have a negative impact on residential amenity.

Additional concerns were expressed regarding drainage and flood risk, particularly in relation to the proposed raising of land levels and the potential impact on nearby lodges. Councillor Brockway concluded by stating that the proposal did not serve the public interest and would negatively affect existing residents. She also noted that no consideration had been given to the safety of families and children using the adjacent road.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Brockway for her comments and asked the Officer if she had any response to the statements.

In response, the Officer addressed several points raised during the discussion. It was clarified that Policy S4 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan was not relevant to the application. The Officer explained that Policy S4 relates to Large, Medium and Small Villages, as defined in the Settlement Hierarchy in Policy S1, which will experience limited growth to support their role and function through allocated sites of 10 or more dwellings in the Local Plan the application site is allocated under Policy S81, which was the applicable policy in this case.

With regard to affordable housing, the Officer confirmed that no provision had been included within the proposal. It was stated that viability assessments had been undertaken throughout the application process and had been reviewed by the Council's consultants, who concluded that the scheme was not viable to support affordable housing contributions.

In relation to highways, the Officer reported that Lincolnshire County Council, as the highways authority, had been consulted and had raised no objections concerning the capacity of the A57.

Finally, the Officer addressed the matter of education contributions. It was confirmed that Lincolnshire County Council, as the education authority, had been consulted and had not requested any contribution in connection with the application.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for her response and opened the floor for discussion. Councillor Fleetwood declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Witham Third Internal Drainage Board, which had submitted comments in relation to the application.

Councillor Barrett also declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of the Witham Third Internal Drainage Board and noted concerns regarding drainage and flood risk associated with the proposal.

Councillor Tom Smith declared a pecuniary interest due to his employment with Sir Edward Leigh MP, as recorded in his declaration of pecuniary interests. He confirmed that he had not communicated with or undertaken any work related to the application.

Members discussed the history of the Burton Waters development and acknowledged the presence of residents attending the meeting. It was noted that the community had developed over the past twenty-five years and that the application before the Committee represented a significant proposal for the area.

Reference was made to the comments submitted by the Internal Drainage Board, which had objected in principle to new development. Concerns were raised regarding site levels and

the potential for flooding, particularly in relation to nearby lodges. It was questioned whether the proposed operations would adequately address these issues.

Support was expressed for a site visit, with Members noting the strong level of local interest and the importance of understanding the site's context. It was suggested that a visit would allow Members to assess the relationship between the proposed development and the existing community.

Clarification was sought regarding the outline planning permission and whether it had specified the type of development expected on the site. The Officer responded that the earlier permission had been for a larger development and that the current application represented the reserved matters for this part of the site.

Further questions were raised regarding the provision of fire hydrants, as recommended by the Fire and Rescue Service. Officers confirmed that this matter would be addressed through building regulations.

Concerns were also expressed regarding the process by which the site had transitioned from a C2 to a C3 use through the granting of a Lawful Development Certificate. It was emphasised that lessons should be learned to prevent similar situations in future.

Members requested that Officers provide a clear explanation of the betterments offered by the current proposal in comparison to the scheme. It was stated that if no material improvements could be identified, the application should be refused. However, if betterments were present, these should be clearly outlined in advance of any site visit to assist Members in their assessment.

The Officer responded to queries by confirming that the permission was for a denser development comprising eighteen terraced blocks of properties. While the current proposal was still considered relatively dense, it was stated that it offered improvements in comparison, including increased landscaping, enhanced parking provision, and efforts to meet biodiversity net gain and energy efficiency standards, which would not be delivered under the extant scheme.

A Member raised questions regarding the unadopted status of the road serving the development, noting the presence of poles in the carriageway and querying whether the road would be adopted upon completion. The Officer confirmed that the road would remain unadopted. A further question was raised regarding bus infrastructure, referencing a trigger point in a previous planning application. The Officer advised that a bus stop was located further along within the Lakeshore development.

A proposal was then made and seconded that a site visit be undertaken. Upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED that the application be deferred for a site visit to be held, to afford Members a greater understanding of the potential development site including the safety of the location, and access to the site.

The Chairman introduced the application and invited the Officer to share his presentation. The Planning Officer confirmed that no updates had been received and proceeded with a summary of the proposal. The application sought permission for the installation of four silos at the RPC facility on Gallimore Lane Industrial Estate, Market Rasen. Two silos had been proposed to the north and two to the south of the site, each adjacent to existing silos.

West Lindsey District Council's Tree and Landscape Officer had reviewed the proposed road widening and confirmed acceptance of the plan, subject to advisory conditions regarding the treatment of existing trees, which were to be included in any recommendation for approval.

Visuals were presented showing the proposed elevations and locations. It was noted that the southern silos would be partially obscured by existing structures. A plan showing proposed road widening at the rear of the site was included to facilitate vehicle access. The Landscape Officer had reviewed and accepted the proposal, subject to advisory conditions.

The site had been identified as part of an established employment area within the local development plan. The proposed silo locations were shown on existing hardstanding surfaces. Photographs were shown to illustrate the relationship of the site to nearby residential properties, including views from 25 Caistor Road and Sunnymede cottages.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his presentation and stated there were three speakers registered for this application, and invited Mr Alan Scoffin, as agent, to take his seat.

A statement was delivered by Mr Alan Scoffin of Ross Davies Associates, acting as the planning consultant on behalf of the applicant, Amcor (formerly known as RPC).

It was stated that the Gallimore Lane Industrial Estate had been established since the mid-1960s and had accommodated a range of industrial and commercial businesses. The site, originally known as the Plastic Box Company, had operated in various forms since that time. For over thirty years, the facility had produced specialist packaging for the healthcare, food and personal care sectors.

It was reported that the site currently employed 125 residents, thereby contributing to the local economy. The facility specialised in Injection Blow Moulding (IBM), a niche technology in the United Kingdom, which enabled the production of complex precision packaging with reduced waste compared to traditional methods.

It was explained that, to remain competitive, the site required periodic updates and modifications. A new project had been secured from a major global brand, which would utilise IBM technology and was expected to generate approximately £4.5 million in revenue. The project was anticipated to create at least twelve new jobs and support the long-term viability of the site.

To facilitate this development, permission was being sought for the installation of four new silos. These would support the storage and handling of materials specific to the new production line, including post-consumer recycled polymers. The proposal aligned with both the company's and its clients' sustainability objectives, particularly in reducing reliance on virgin polymers and lowering energy consumption.

It was concluded that the development would support local employment and reinforce

Market Rasen's role as a centre for sustainable specialist manufacturing.

The Chairman thanked Mr Scoffin for his statement and invited the second speaker, Mrs Karen Dowle, as objector, to take her seat. Mrs Dowle had provided two images on printed paper of her property, for the Members to view. The Democratic and Civic Officer distributed these whilst Mrs Dowle took her seat.

Mrs Dowle explained that both households were situated directly on the southern and southeastern boundaries of the RPC site. Objection was raised to the proposed installation of additional silos on the southern side of the factory, on the grounds of adverse impact on residential amenity.

A brief history of previous planning consents was outlined. It was stated that in 2003 and 2004, permission had been granted for five silos, including two on the southern side. It was reported that RPC had originally proposed all silos on the northern side but had been instructed by the Council to relocate two to the south. The interrelationship between the silos and neighbouring dwellings had been deemed acceptable at that time.

In 2018, further silos had been approved on the southern side despite objections. It was stated that the resulting seven silos had significantly affected the outlook, light, and noise environment of the neighbouring properties. It was further noted that landscaping conditions attached to the 2003 consent had not been implemented, and that existing vegetation had predated the development.

Mrs Dowle raised concerns regarding drainage, with reference to a riparian ditch located along the eastern boundary. It was stated that runoff from the site discharged into the ditch, which ultimately flowed into the River Rase. A flooding incident in 2002 was recalled, during which gardens and the speaker's home had been inundated. It was asserted that RPC had failed to maintain the ditch, despite being responsible for it.

Noise impacts were described as severe and ongoing. It was stated that although forklift movements had been restricted during night hours, noise from silo filling, machinery, and roof-mounted air vents had become increasingly disruptive. It was reported that vibrations from factory operations had been felt within the dwelling, with supporting evidence, not shown to the Committee, recorded using a mobile application.

It was acknowledged that the speaker's husband had been employed at the factory for over twenty years and that the success of the business was not opposed. However, it was argued that the southern side of the site had become overdeveloped, and that further intensification would be unacceptable. A suggestion was made that the new silos be relocated to the western side of the site, where space and access were considered more appropriate.

Doubts were expressed regarding the operational need for additional silos, given the reported underuse of existing machinery. Mrs Dowle raised questions as to whether existing silos could be repurposed or removed if obsolete.

Environmental concerns were also raised, particularly in relation to plastic waste and water discharge. A request was made for non-financial mitigation, including the planting of trees and shrubs, the installation of sound reducing fencing, and meaningful consultation with affected residents. It was stated that no engagement had taken place with the applicant.

Mrs Dowle concluded by questioning whether further silo applications would be submitted in future and called for a clear limit to be established. It was stated that, if necessary, the matter would be referred to the Environment Agency.

The Chairman thanked Mrs Dowle for her comments, and welcomed the final speaker on this application, Councillor Bunney, as Ward Member, to take his seat.

Councillor Bunney declared an interest that he sits on Market Rasen Town Council who had also discussed the application, he confirmed he was speaking in his capacity as a Member of the District Council, the County Council and Market Rasen Town Council.

Councillor Bunney stated that, in principle, support existed for industrial activity within Market Rasen Town, recognising the importance of employment and economic development. However, concern was expressed regarding the proposed location of the silos on the southern side of the site, which was near several residential properties, including Sunnymede cottages, 25 Caistor Road, and a nearby bungalow.

He acknowledged that noise, vibration, and drainage issues had been reported by residents. While he felt some of these matters could be mitigated through appropriate works, concern remained that the installation of four additional silos on the southern boundary would exacerbate existing problems.

It was suggested that alternative locations existed within the site where the silos could be accommodated, and that such options should have been explored through negotiation between the applicant and the planning authority. Concern was raised regarding the removal of a landscaped mound and several trees, which had previously provided partial screening. It was noted that the trees were deciduous and therefore did not offer year-round noise mitigation.

Reference was made to a proposed delivery time condition within the application, limiting activity to between 08:00 and 19:00 on weekdays. However, it was noted by Councillor Bunney that noise associated with the transfer of materials from tankers into silos could occur outside these hours, and that such operations had been reported by residents on both sides of Gallamore Lane.

Councillor Bunney acknowledged that living adjacent to an industrial site presented challenges, but it was emphasised that the affected properties were subject to significant and persistent noise. It was suggested that relocation of the silos to the western or northern sides of the site would be preferable. It was noted that a residential property existed to the north, but that it appeared to experience fewer issues due to the presence of mature trees.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Bunney for his comments and looked to the Planning Officer to respond.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the site was an established employment area and that the proposed silos formed part of the factory's expansion. It was stated that drainage would not be worsened, as existing storm drains would not receive additional runoff. Partial responsibility for the adjacent ditch had been acknowledged by the applicant, with maintenance reported.

A noise report had been requested, the results of which indicated low impact without mitigation. It was clarified that only two silos were proposed on the southern side, not four. West Lindsey District Council's Tree and Landscape Officer had advised that the excavation works for road widening would not harm existing trees, which were unprotected and within the applicant's ownership.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his response and opened the floor for discussion.

A Member of the Committee expressed understanding of the concerns raised by residents, based on prior experience working in an industrial setting adjacent to residential areas. Reference was made to the planning history, noting that previous silos had been directed to the southern side of the site. It was questioned why this location had been chosen, given the proximity to dwellings.

It was suggested that the western side of the site, which faced the wider industrial estate, would have been more appropriate. The Committee Member noted that in similar industrial contexts, noisy infrastructure was typically positioned away from residential boundaries to minimise disturbance. Clarification was requested regarding the original decision to locate silos near residential properties. The Officer confirmed that the question regarding the original placement of silos could not be answered, as they had not been involved in the earlier application and no documentation had been found to explain the decision.

A Member of the Committee noted that reference was made to the shared concerns expressed by the Ward Member, objectors, and the Town Council regarding the proposed location of the silos. It was suggested that the relocation of silos within the site might be feasible, as materials such as plastic pellets could be conveyed over distance using pressurised systems.

A question was raised as to whether any discussions had taken place with the applicant regarding alternative siting. It was confirmed by the Officer that no such discussions had occurred.

The Committee Member then proposed that the application might be deferred to allow for such engagement, with the aim of achieving a mutually acceptable outcome.

The Development Management Team Leader stated that during Officer site visits, the levels of noise and vibration reported by residents had not been observed. A noise impact assessment had been requested and submitted. The report indicated that the silos were active for an average of six minutes per hour, with noise occurring in two phases, increasing as materials were drawn into the ducting. The assessment concluded that the impact was low and that no mitigation was required. It was further stated that the addition of two further silos was not expected to result in a significant increase in noise. However, the Committee was advised by the Development Management Team Leader that it remained open to defer the application should it wish to explore alternative locations for the silos. The feasibility of such alternatives would need to be confirmed with the applicant.

A Member expressed support for deferring the application to allow further checks and requested that specific amendments be considered. Concern was raised regarding the removal of earth near the road and the potential impact on tree stability. It was suggested

that structural support may be required to prevent root exposure and possible tree failure.

An amendment was proposed to include the planting of fast-growing screening species, between existing trees to enhance visual and acoustic screening. Additionally, concern was expressed regarding the proposed delivery hours, which excluded restrictions on weekends. An amendment was requested to extend delivery restrictions to Saturdays and Sundays.

It was confirmed by the Development Management Team Leader that the proposed delivery condition could be amended to include weekends.

The Development Management Team Leader advised that while discussions could be held with the applicant regarding alternative silo locations, the planning authority could only assess the application as submitted. It was also clarified that enforcement of riparian clearance fell under the remit of the Internal Drainage Board, not the Local Planning Authority.

Having been seconded and voted upon, it was

RESOLVED that the application be deferred in order for Officers to request further information regarding potential alternative locations for the proposed silos and/or appropriate mitigation measures in response to noise complaints.

14 WL/2024/00504 - LAND TO REAR OF BRINKBURN HOUSE, CHURCH STREET, SCOTHERN

The Committee gave consideration to the third application on the agenda, application number WL/2024/00504 seeking planning permission to erect three dwellings with a new access driveway and associated parking and garaging, as well as a replacement garage serving No.16 Church Street, at the land to the rear of Brinkburn House, Church Street, Scothern.

Elevations and floor plans for Plot One and its associated garage were presented. The drainage plan had been reviewed and accepted, with consultation undertaken with the Council's Building Control team.

It was noted that the application had been amended during the process following consultation with West Lindsey District Council's Conservation Officer. Amendments had been made to preserve views of the nearby listed church tower from the public right of way.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his presentation and with no registered speakers for this application, opened the floor for Members to discuss.

A query was raised regarding whether the access road serving the proposed dwellings would be private and how waste collection would be managed. It was confirmed by the Officer that the road would likely be private, serving only three new dwellings and one existing property. However, the Officer was unable to confirm the proposed location for bin storage.

Concern was expressed that, without a designated bin storage area, multiple bins would be

placed on Church Street, potentially affecting visibility and amenity. A request was made for a condition requiring the provision of a bin storage area within the site, accessible to waste collection operatives.

It was noted that, in general, residents were responsible for presenting bins at the kerbside for collection. The Vice-Chairman confirmed that this was standard practice for properties accessed via private roads.

The Chairman acknowledged the discussion and proceeded to propose acceptance of the Officer's recommendation, with no further speakers indicating a wish to contribute.

The proposal to accept the Officers recommendations was duly seconded and voted upon. It was therefore agreed that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

Recommended 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 hereby permitted shall take place until a written Habitat Management and Maintenance Plan [HMMP] in accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric dated 12/12/2024 and prepared by Michelle Huang has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The HMMP shall relate to all 'significant' biodiversity gains on site (excluding any habitat within or making up private garden) and must be strictly adhered to and implemented in full for a minimum of 30 years following the initial completion period approved pursuant to condition 13. The HMMP must contain the following:
 - a) a non-technical summary;
 - b) the roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering/monitoring the [HMMP];
 - c) the details of funding, resources and mechanisms for long term delivery of the [HMMP].
 - d) the planned habitat creation and enhancement works for the initial completion period to create or improve habitat in accordance with best practice.
 - e) the management measures to maintain habitat for a period of 30 years from completion in accordance with best practice;
 - f) the monitoring methodology and frequency in respect of the retained, created and/or enhanced habitat to be submitted to the local planning authority. Surveys may be completed by a competent person as

defined by the small site metric user guide.

- Expected monitoring years 5,10,15,20,30
- g) the mechanisms of adaptive management and remedial measures to account for changes in the work schedule to achieve required targets.

Applicants are advised to use the Natural England Small Site HMMP Template found at <https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5813530037846016>

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. No development shall take place until details of faunal species enhancements including their positions, types and specifications have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Enhancements must include
- A minimum of a single bat roost unit incorporated into each structure (access via bat roof tile).
 - A minimum of a single bird nesting brick unit incorporated into each structure
 - A minimum of a single bee brick unit incorporated each structure
 - Hedgehog appropriate fencing
 - Amphibian friendly drain and curb treatments

The details approved must be installed prior to occupation of each individual dwelling and must be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of nature conservation and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy S60 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

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

4. The Biodiversity Gain Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric dated 12/12/2024 and prepared by Michelle Huang.

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.

5. 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:

Site Location Plan J2226 00101 Rev A dated March 2023
Proposed Block Plan J2226 00108 Rev H dated 11/02/2025
Plot 1 Plans Section and Elevations J2226 00104 Rev E dated 20/09/2024
Plot 1 Proposed Garage J2226 00110 Rev C dated 15/09/2024
Plot 2 Plans Section and Elevations J2226 00105 Rev F dated 10/02/2025
Plot 3 Proposed Garage J2226 00115 dated August 2023
Plot 3 Plans Section and Elevations J2226 00106 Rev E dated 22/03/2024

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 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

6. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accordance with the details set out in the submitted Energy Statement dated April 2025 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.

7. 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 dated April 2025 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.

8. The development must be completed in strict accordance with the drainage strategy as detailed within the drawings and details within 'Drainage Strategy Report' Rev C dated 28/05/2025 including the surface water maintenance methods on page 16. No occupation must occur until the approved scheme has been installed and retained and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate drainage facilities are provided to serve the dwellings, to reduce the risk of flooding and to prevent the pollution of the water environment to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy S21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

9. No occupation of the dwellings hereby approved must take place until a landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details to include (but not limited to):

- Type, height, specification and position of all boundary treatments.
- Material finish of all any access roads, driveways, patios and paths.
- Species, planting height, formation and position of new trees and hedging.

The development must be completed in strict accordance with the approved landscaping scheme.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate landscaping is introduced and would not unacceptably impact on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area or the amenity of nearby residents to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policies S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

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

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

11. Prior to occupation of the approved dwelling, evidence must be submitted to the local planning authority that a rainwater harvesting butt of a minimum 100 litres has been installed.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable water management in accordance with policy S12 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

12. The dwellings hereby approved shall be constructed to ensure that the consumption of wholesome water by persons occupying the dwellings is in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document G, Requirement G2/Regulation 36 Optional Technical Requirement of 110 litres per person per day.

Reason: To minimise impacts on the water environment and to accord with Optional Technical Housing Standards to accord with Policies S12 and S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

13. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment undertaken by Roy Lobley Consulting dated October 2024 including the following mitigation measure it details:

- Plots 1 & 2 minimum floor level 12.90m AOD.
- Flood resilience to 13.20m AOD.
- Surface water exceedance route around buildings.

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants in line with Policy S21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

14. The development hereby approved must only be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out in sections 4 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment completed by Arbtech dated 20/12/2024.

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.

15. Notice in writing shall be given to the Council within 15 working days of the Initial habitat creation and enhancement works as set out in the [HMMP] being completed.

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 Policy S61 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

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

16. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping as required by condition 9 shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting 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, in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and occupiers of adjacent buildings and in accordance with Policies S53, S60 and S61 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

17. 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.

18. Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, AA, B, C, E, F, G and H of Schedule 2 Part 1 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) the dwellings hereby permitted must not be extended and no buildings or structures must be erected within or on the curtilage of the dwellings, or alterations made to the roof of each respective dwelling unless planning permission has first been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable any such proposals to be assessed in terms of their impact on the character of the area, the setting of the non-designated heritage asset, and the amenities of neighbouring dwellings, to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies S53 and S57 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

15 WL/2025/00326 - LORD STREET, GAINSBOROUGH

The Chairman introduced the fourth application of the meeting and invited the Officer to present. The Officer provided a presentation and confirmed that there were no updates to report. The application had been brought before the Committee as it represented a departure from parking standards and Policy S49 of the Local Plan. Otherwise, it would likely have been determined under delegated powers.

The proposal sought permission for the creation of three residential units while retaining a reduced retail unit on the ground floor. The scheme also included repair works to the

building to restore it to a suitable standard. The Officer presented existing and proposed floor plans and elevations, noting that the retail unit would front onto Lord Street, with three flats located across the ground and upper floors. Photographs were shown to illustrate the current condition of the building, which had been vacant for some time.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his presentation and invited the only speaker on this application, Mr Matt Deakins as Agent, to address the Committee.

Mr Deakins stated that the Officer's report had comprehensively covered the key points. He emphasised that the building had been long vacant and was in a poor state of repair. His client had made efforts to acquire the western portion of the building, which was under separate ownership, in order to deliver a comprehensive redevelopment, though these efforts had not yet been successful.

It was noted that the building was a heritage asset within the town centre and had been identified within the Townscape Heritage Scheme. The applicant intended to submit a funding application under this scheme, subject to timing.

Mr Deakins explained that the retail unit had been vacant for approximately five years, with the upper floors unused for several decades. He described the internal condition as extremely poor, with limited access to parts of the building. The proposed scheme would reduce the size of the retail unit, which was considered more marketable, and introduce three residential units, bringing the upper floors back into use.

The lack of on-site parking was acknowledged as the reason for the application being considered by the Committee. However, it was noted that the site had never had parking provision and was located within a pedestrianised area of the town centre, with access to public transport and amenities. Cycle storage and external storage facilities had been incorporated into the scheme.

The Chairman thanked Mr Deakins for his statement and invited Members to comment.

A Member expressed appreciation to the agent for the detailed explanation and welcomed the proposal, noting that the building had been in a poor state for many years. It was considered a significant improvement for the town centre.

Further support was expressed by another Member, commenting that the site's location within a pedestrianised zone made parking concerns less relevant. The building was described as being in unacceptable condition, and the proposed development was seen as a substantial improvement. It was noted that many properties in Gainsborough were being brought up to standard, which was welcomed.

A further Member also expressed support, stating that both the developer and Officer had done a commendable job. The photographs demonstrated the building's poor condition, and the proposed scheme was expected to result in a significant visual improvement.

The Chairman added that the development was a welcome transformation of a long-standing eyesore. Interest in acquiring the adjacent property was noted, and it was suggested that this could potentially address parking concerns, as the neighbouring site (a former public house) included space to the rear.

With no further comments the proposal to accept the Officer's recommendations was duly seconded and voted upon. It was therefore 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 or conversions works shall take place until a level 2 Historic Building Record of the buildings has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

3. No conversion works shall take place until details showing the areas of masonry to be demolished and setting out the method of ensuring the safety and stability of the building fabric identified to be retained throughout the phases of demolition and reconstruction have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details are to include structural engineering drawings and/or a method statement. The work shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate materials in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the listed building and its surroundings to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy S53 and S57 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

4. No conversion works shall take place until details of the following external materials including the colour finish to be used have either been inspected on site or submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Sample of brick type and size, bond, texture and mortar for openings to be bricked up;
- Type, size, material and finish of the proposed skylight;
- Joinery details for the timber external door (north elevation) at a scale of no less than 1:20, including materials, glazing bars, method of opening, colour and finish, as well as frame and surround;
- Paint finish and colour for all external joinery (please see informative);
- Sample panel of pointing.

The development must be completed in strict accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the use of appropriate materials in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the listed building and its surroundings to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy S53 and S57 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

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

5. The works shall follow the schedule of works as detailed on drawing RD:5749 – 04 dated January 2025 (Proposed Floor Plans and Details) unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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.

6. 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:

- Proposed Site and Location Plans: RD:5749 – 07 dated March 2025
- Proposed Elevations/Sections: RD:5749 - 06 dated March 2025
- Proposed Floor Plans and Details: RD:5749 – 04 dated January 2025
- Proposed Floor Plans: RD:5749 – 03 Rev A dated 27/03/2025

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.

16 WL/2025/00431 - HICKMAN STREET, GAINSBOROUGH

The Chairman introduced the application and invited the Officer to make her presentation.

The Officer provided a brief presentation on the application, which sought retrospective advertisement consent for a fascia sign. The sign related to a recently opened gym and included some illumination details. Site photographs were shown, highlighting similar fascia signage in the surrounding area.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for her presentation and confirmed that the application had been brought before the Committee solely because the applicant was a relative of a council Officer.

With no comments from Members, having been proposed, seconded and voted upon it was therefore agreed that the permissions be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The grant of express consent expires five years from the date of the grant of consent.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007.

2. No advertisement is to be displayed without the permission of the owner of the site or any other person with an interest in the site entitled to grant permission.

3. No advertisement shall be sited or displayed so as to—

(a) endanger persons using any highway, railway, waterway, dock, harbour or aerodrome (civil or military);

(b) obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of, any traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air; or

(c) hinder the operation of any device used for the purpose of security or surveillance or for measuring the speed of any vehicle.

4. Any advertisement displayed, and any site used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a condition that does not impair the visual amenity of the site.

5. Any structure or hoarding erected or used principally for the purpose of displaying advertisements shall be maintained in a condition that does not endanger the public.

6. Where an advertisement is required under these Regulations to be removed, the site shall be left in a condition that does not endanger the public or impair visual amenity.

7. 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: A-004 Rev P2 (Existing and Proposed Elevations) dated 29/07/2024, Signage Dimension received 30/04/2024 and Illumination Detail received 30/04/2025. 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.

17 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS

The Chairman confirmed that there were no appeal determinations to note.

The Development Management Team Manager provided updates on two appeal matters.

The Committee was advised that an appeal had been lodged following the refusal of planning permission for a battery energy storage system near Willingham by Stow, which had been considered by the Committee in February 2025. The appeal would be heard at a public hearing, with the date yet to be confirmed. It was noted that Councillors Mullally (as Ward Member) and Bailey would act as Member leads, as the decision had been a Member overturn.

A further appeal had been submitted in relation to the refusal of a battery storage scheme near Reepham, which had been considered at the December 2024 Planning Committee. The Planning Inspectorate had indicated that this appeal would be heard at a full four-day

public inquiry scheduled for October 2025. The Committee was advised that a Member lead would be sought, either from the Planning Committee or the relevant Ward Member, and further communication on this would follow.

The Chairman indicated that any Members interested in acting as a lead for the upcoming inquiry should contact the Development Management Team Manager.

18 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - FORMAL CASE UPDATE

With no comments, questions or requirement for a vote, the Planning Enforcement Report was **NOTED**.

The meeting concluded at 8.03 pm.

Chairman