

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall on 23 July 2025 commencing at 6.30 pm.

Present: Councillor Ian Fleetwood (Chairman for this meeting)
Councillor John Barrett
Councillor Owen Bierley
Councillor Matthew Boles
Councillor Karen Carless
Councillor David Dobbie
Councillor Tom Smith
Councillor Peter Morris

In Attendance:
Russell Clarkson Development Management Team Manager
Ian Elliott Development Management Team Leader
Danielle Peck Senior Development Management Officer
Paul Weeks Legal Advisor
Natalie Smalley Democratic and Civic Officer

Also in Attendance: 44 members of the public

Apologies: Councillor Roger Patterson
Councillor Paul Swift

Membership: Councillor Peter Morris was appointed substitute for Councillor Roger Patterson.

19 TO OPEN THE MEETING AND APPOINT A CHAIRMAN

The Democratic and Civic Officer opened the meeting and explained that, as there was currently no Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee, the first item of business for the Committee was to appoint a Chairman for the meeting. Proposals were duly sought.

A Member of the Committee proposed Councillor Fleetwood, this was duly seconded.

Having been proposed and seconded, and no other proposals forthcoming, it was

RESOLVED that Cllr Fleetwood would be the Chairman for the duration of the meeting.

Upon taking the Chair, Cllr Fleetwood sought to clarify Members' voting rights for both of the planning application items on the agenda. It was explained that not all Members of the Committee had been able to attend the previous meeting on 25 June 2025, and/or site visit on 11 July 2025, due to unavailability, or not being sitting Members of the Planning

Committee at the time, and therefore would be unable to vote on a particular item/(s).

It was clarified that with regard to application number 145475 (WL/2024/00015), land at Woodcock Lane, Burton Waters, the following Members would be able to vote: Councillors Barrett, Boles, Carless, Dobbie, and Fleetwood.

Regarding the second planning application on the agenda, number WL/2025/00182, RPC Containers Ltd, Gallamore Lane Industrial Estate, Market Rasen, the following Members would be able to vote: Councillors Barrett, Boles, Carless, Dobbie, Fleetwood, and Smith.

20 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

There was no public participation.

21 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 25 June 2025, be confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Dobbie wished to clarify his attendance of the 11 July 2025 site visit to the Committee and those present. It was explained that concerns had been raised about his attendance, however, that he had been working a nightshift the night before the site visit, and woke up early to attend the visit, albeit arriving late. Cllr Dobbie stated that upon locating the group, he had missed the initial instructions, meaning that when later in the site visit he was spoken to by the two local Ward Members, he was unaware that he was not permitted to do so. He then explained that he was asked to rejoin the main group in accordance with the initial instructions.

Cllr Dobbie continued, noting that it was important to have Councillors from a range of different backgrounds, including working people, rather than relying on those who were retired, unemployed, or independently wealthy. To conclude, he apologised for his lateness to the site visit and explained that he had similar work commitments during the online Planning Committee training resulting in him missing part of it. However, it was noted that he attended online where possible and revisited the circulated slides after the training to ensure his understanding.

Cllr Morris explained to the Committee that he had been informed by Officers prior to the meeting that he was unable to vote on either of the planning application items but was able to partake in the surrounding discussion, which was then confirmed by the Democratic and Civic Officer.

Cllr Bierley highlighted that he was also unable to vote on either of the planning application items on the agenda. He explained that this was due to his appointment to the Planning Committee on 7 July 2025, meaning that he was unable to attend previous meetings where both applications had been previously heard.

23 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT/LOCAL CHANGES IN PLANNING POLICY

The Committee heard from the Development Management Team Manager, who gave a summary of changes to national planning policy. It was explained that the Planning and Infrastructure Bill cleared the House of Commons in June and was now at the Committee stage in the House of Lords. The Manager stated that changes were being tabled to the part of legislation that would empower Government Advisor Natural England to prepare a new type of plan known as an “environmental delivery plan”; this was in regard to the test to be used by the Secretary of State to approve and adopt a plan.

In relation to Neighbourhood Plans, it was explained that regarding the Dunholme Review, a referendum was to be held on 24 July 2025. In terms of the Saxilby with Ingleby Review, consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan’s Reg 16 submission version was underway and would close on the 22 August 2025. Lastly, regarding Grasby and Searby-cum-Owmby, the consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan’s Reg 14 pre-submission version had closed on 6 July 2025.

24 145475 (WL/2024/00015) - LAND AT WOODCOCK LANE, BURTON WATERS

The Committee then gave consideration to the first application on the agenda, application number 145475 (WL2024/00015), seeking planning permission for the erection of 66 residential dwellings with associated access, parking, and landscaping, on land at Woodcock Lane, Burton Waters.

The Officer confirmed that there were no updates, however, it was noted with regard to the wording of the viability clause, negotiations with the Applicant were still ongoing. In the event that agreement on the wording could not be reached, it was recommended that the application be referred back to Committee to consider an alternative form of the clause, subject to agreement.

The Officer made reference to the fallback position previously discussed at the last meeting, which had been confirmed through a Lawful Development Certificate; it was stated that the evidence had been submitted to demonstrate that a material commencement had occurred. It was also clarified that the extra care housing provision had not been secured and, as such, the dwellings could be categorised as C3 dwellings.

Matters arising from the Committee site visit on 11 July 2025 were subsequently addressed. Questions had been asked regarding whether a particular area was subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO); it was confirmed to be a group TPO. A tree protection measures plan had been submitted in support of the scheme and was recommended to be secured via condition.

It was explained that at the site visit further clarification was sought regarding the location of the attenuation pond, and it was identified on the plan north of the application site. In addition, the matter of the cut and fill exercise was discussed. Reference was made to the existing topographical survey, it was observed during the site visit that the land exhibited notable variation in elevation, thereby confirming existing contours across the site. The

proposed contour cut and fill plan was then presented. It was explained that the intended effect of the cut and fill exercise was to elevate the development out of Flood Zones 2 and 3, positioning it entirely within Flood Zone 1. The presentation concluded with the Officer presenting the site plan, floor plans, and photographs of the location and surrounding area.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for her presentation and stated that there were six registered speakers; the first speaker, Cllr Sue North, as Parish Council Representative, was invited to address the Committee.

Cllr North gave a summary of the differences between the existing communities and the proposed development, and the extent to which the proposed plan conflicted materially with the established residential character of the locality. It was noted that, over a number of years, the Planning Committee had supported the development of three older-living/retirement communities. Cllr North explained that approval had previously been granted by for age-restricted dwellings, one community designated for those over 45 years of age and two for those over 55. The existing developments were comprised of single-storey lodges or bungalows with large areas of natural open space, whereas it was claimed that the proposed units were to be much larger in comparison, with minimal surrounding open space.

Vehicle usage within the existing communities was reported as minimal, with most residents possessing a single vehicle and generally not requiring travel for work or education. The proposed development was expected to introduce multiple vehicle ownership per household and a regular need for travel related to school, work, and leisure, thereby contributing to a significant increase in vehicle movements.

It was asserted that the proposal conflicted markedly with the adjacent communities in all significant respects. Although it was acknowledged that the previous classification error between C2 and C3 was regrettable, it was stated that such a mistake did not necessitate the approval of a C3 application in this form. Cllr North emphasised that all proposals were still required to make a positive contribution to the locality and to respect and reflect the character of the area in both use and design.

Vegetative screening was identified as a critical consideration, particularly along the Foss Dyke Canal, Woodcock Lane, and the A57. It was pointed out that the screening vegetation in question was deciduous, rendering it less effective for nearly half the year. During this period, unobstructed views were anticipated from the Foss Dyke towpath through the proposed development, across the Burton Waters lodges, and onwards to the A57. Cllr North concluded by urging the Committee to acknowledge the distinctive nature of the communities already established and supported in this area, and to reject the current proposal for predominantly large, four-bedroom family homes.

The Chairman thanked Cllr North for her comments and invited the second registered speaker, Mr David Barker, as Agent, to address the Committee.

Mr Barker explained that the proposal had resulted from over two years of collaboration with Planning Officers and various stakeholders. It was stated that the site had been allocated for development in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP), with existing consent in place for 100 market dwellings, predominantly arranged in sizable two-storey blocks. The Agent stated that scheme currently before the Committee comprised 66 dwellings, a lower density

than the consented 100. It was noted that this reduction would improve residential amenity for existing residents, enhance open space provision, and create greater scope for wildlife habitats.

It was explained that areas of Burton Waters located to the north of the Leisure Centre had been designed to be flood resilient at the time planning permission was granted in 2013. Mr Barker highlighted that while much of this flood mitigation work had already been completed, the application site remained the key outstanding area within the approved compensation strategy. It was stated that the scheme had been specifically designed to address flooding concerns affecting adjacent land, including the fishing lodges and the Lakeshore development.

The Agent confirmed that each relevant flood authority had expressed satisfaction with the drainage arrangements, and the Environment Agency had also confirmed its agreement. It was stated that approval of this proposal would substantially reduce the flood risk on the application site and offer wider benefits to northern areas of Burton Waters, constituting a solution to ongoing flooding concerns rather than creating new challenges.

The Agent made reference to observations from the Committee site visit. It had been noted that a roadway and tree belt separated the proposed homes from the existing lodge development. The designers had reportedly taken care to ensure that no loss of amenity would occur for the lodge residents. The trees along the Woodcock Lane boundary were either currently protected under Tree Preservation Orders or would be subject to protection via conditions on any forthcoming planning approval. The current proposal was said to retain more trees than the extant scheme and it was noted that no objections had been received from statutory consultees.

It was further reported that medium-sized sites such as the application site were important to local housebuilders and the Applicant had committed to identifying a local builder to deliver the scheme.

Concerns regarding the two-storey nature of the proposal were acknowledged. However, it was stated that the proportion of single- and two-storey dwellings within this proposal mirrored that found within the extant 100-dwelling scheme.

Mr Barker continued, adding that application had been amended to comply with new CLLP policies, and now satisfied more stringent requirements related to sustainability and biodiversity. It was confirmed that a financial contribution of £41,000 to the NHS was offered as part of the scheme, along with a substantial payment through the Community Infrastructure Levy. The Agent confirmed that all proposed dwellings were to be equipped with electric vehicle charging points. Thirty percent of homes were to be M42 compliant, and car and cycle parking provision met current standards.

Mr Barker stated that affordable housing could be delivered if viability conditions improved, and a financial contribution could be made to support provision where needed in the wider district.

In terms of biodiversity, it was highlighted that the proposal was expected to deliver biodiversity gains, with 10% net gain achieved on-site. It was explained that completion of Woodcock Lane was also included in the proposal, improving pedestrian safety. Local

concerns regarding road conditions had recently been raised, and the scheme was presented as a positive response to those issues.

The Agent made reference to comments suggesting that the character of Burton Waters would be altered by family occupancy. It was clarified that more than 350 dwellings in the area currently had no occupancy restrictions, and as such the application would not alter the established residential character.

It was stated that the site had remained incomplete for many years and that approval of the current application would help bring closure and completion. A low-density approach was considered the best option for the site and most likely to result in timely delivery. The fallback scheme for 100 homes was said to lack the improvements required under the new CLLP, and if refused, would represent the only viable alternative. It was further stated that the fallback scheme would not deliver the same benefits in terms of biodiversity, NHS contributions, or the community infrastructure levy. The Committee was asked to support the proposal.

The Chairman thanked Mr Barker for his comments and invited the third and fourth registered speakers, Mr Alistair Anderson and Mr Mike Bryan, as Objectors, to address the Committee. It was explained that Mr Anderson and Mr Bryan would be sharing the allotted five minutes speaking time between them.

The Committee was addressed by Mr Alistair Anderson, representing the Burton Waters Management Company, the Burton Waters Residents Group, and the Recognised Tenants' Association. It was stated that the Committee was faced with a difficult decision resulting from an error in 2013, when planning permission had not been legally bound to the intended provision of extra care. This error had led to a series of events which had rendered the site vulnerable to inappropriate development. It was acknowledged by Mr Anderson that the extant permission could not be altered. However, it was emphasised that the Committee retained the ability to act proactively in the interests of good planning and design. Support for development on the site was expressed, though it was noted that the application in its current form contained significant inefficiencies.

Concern was raised that 92% of the proposed dwellings would be two-storey structures situated within an established area of single-storey lodges. The scale of the proposed development was considered incongruent with the character of the surrounding environment and detrimental to neighbouring residents. Mr Anderson explained that the extant permission had included single-storey buildings along the Woodcock Lane boundary. It was stated that no upgrade to the road or connected pavements in the area had been proposed, resulting in a gap of approximately 50 to 60 metres of unpaved road which pedestrians, including children, could be required to navigate.

Mr Anderson stated that no provision for affordable housing, either on-site or elsewhere, had been made in the proposal, and it was reported that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) had assessed the scheme as unviable and undeliverable. A housing shortfall had also been identified, with only 66 dwellings proposed compared to the previously allocated 100. A contradiction was noted in contributions related to site viability, which were deemed inconsistent with the decision not to maximise the quantum of development.

It was explained that a biodiversity net gain shortfall had been highlighted within the

Committee report, following consultation with the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust. Concern was expressed by Mr Anderson regarding the application of policy leeway based on the determination date occurring prior to the adoption of new policy.

Reference was made to Policy S61, which set minimum standards supposedly not met by the current scheme, and to Policy S53, which required proposals to respond positively to local character and context, a criterion that was considered unmet in this instance. Nonetheless, it was reiterated that support remained for the development of the site, provided it represented good design. Finally, concerns relating to design scale, biodiversity net gain, affordable housing, and highway safety were cited as reasons why the application should not be approved; Mr Anderson concluded by advocating a redesign in collaboration with the community.

Mr Mike Bryan then addressed the Committee. He identified himself as a resident of one of the lodge sites and expressed appreciation for the Committee's historical support of older living and retirement communities in the northern part of Burton Waters. Reference was made to the Barchester Care Home, three age-restricted lodge and bungalow developments, and the extant plan for extra care homes, which together had created what was described as a potentially unique retirement village, embraced by the residents. It was highlighted by Mr Bryan that the proposal would materially alter the nature, appearance, and atmosphere of the area, and that approval would undermine the potential completion of a cohesive retirement village.

Concern was raised that the current proposal conflicted with existing communities, the extant plan, and the broader vision for the area. It was noted that the debate surrounding the application was a consequence of the misclassification error between use classes C2 and C3. While it was accepted that the error could not be undone, it was suggested that the Committee had an opportunity to mitigate its impact.

Reference was made to the demand for age-restricted retirement homes and to the active interest of developers in acquiring land for such projects. The Committee was encouraged to reject the application, protect the existing developments, and invite the submission of an alternative proposal in partnership with a retirement housing provider.

The Chairman thanked Mr Anderson and Mr Bryan for their comments and invited the fifth and sixth registered speakers, Cllr Jackie Brockway and Cllr Paul Lee, as Ward Members, to address the Committee. It was explained that Cllr Brockway and Cllr Lee would be sharing the allotted five minutes speaking time between them.

Cllr Brockway began by expressing full support to the representations made by residents earlier in the meeting. Attention was drawn to the merits of both the extant and proposed plans, on the basis that it had been stated during the previous meeting that, in the absence of any material improvements, the application should be refused.

The Ward Member stated that the extant scheme was designed with area and residents in mind, open, with no private gardens or garages, with the inclusion of extensive communal grounds with a variety of habitats and diverse planting. In contrast, the current application was described as a conventional housing estate, offering private gardens and garages with limited communal open space. Five bungalows were proposed adjacent to the Foss Dyke Canal, though it was stated that they provided no appreciable mitigation of the wider visual

impact. The demographic addressed by the scheme was assumed to be families with children, yet it was stated that no facilities or provision for children had been included, nor sufficient space to incorporate such infrastructure in future. Concern was raised that the development would open directly onto a dangerous road, with limited opportunity for safe pedestrian movement or for families to walk children to school. The proposed scheme was stated to clash markedly with both the extant permission and the character of adjacent communities.

Specific concern was directed towards the interpretation of build density. It was argued that a misleading comparison had been made, noting that the extant scheme had comprised small one- and two-bedroom extra care homes, including 34% apartments. By contrast, it was explained that the proposed scheme comprised 66 dwellings, predominantly large four-bedroom family homes, averaging 3.8 bedrooms each. It was stated that many of the new homes could physically accommodate two of the smaller units found within the extant scheme, raising questions about the accuracy of density assessments expressed as dwellings per hectare.

Cllr Brockway identified vehicle movement as a point of concern. Given the anticipated needs of elderly residents, who it was explained typically did not travel regularly for work, school, or leisure, it was considered the current proposal would result in a substantial increase in vehicle movements across the site.

Although it had been suggested that the proposal offered improvements in other areas, Cllr Brockway concluded that no net gain could be identified when assessed against the extant scheme.

Cllr Lee subsequently addressed the Committee. It was stated that Ward Members had been elected to serve their communities and make decisions that benefit both the wider community and individual residents. While it was stated that numerous surveys and technical reports had been commissioned on the potential impacts of the proposed development, emphasis was placed on maintaining focus on the lived experience of existing residents in Burton Waters. It was noted that residents had chosen to move to Burton Waters for a peaceful and low-stress lifestyle. Concern was expressed over the stress caused by the tone and nature of the current planning application.

The Ward Member acknowledged that the decision before the Committee was difficult and that the correct course was not necessarily the easiest one. However, it was stated that the long-term interests of the community would best be served by rejecting the proposal, thereby preserving the opportunity to fulfil and complete the original vision for Burton Waters.

The Chairman thanked Cllr Brockway and Cllr Lee for their comments and invited a response from the Officer.

The Officer noted that comments from speakers had focused on the perception of the area as a retirement community for those over 45 or over 55. Reference was made to Policy S23 of the CLLP, concerning the accommodation needs of the housing market area. Under the policy, it was explained that developers were expected to provide housing solutions that contributed to meeting those identified needs. The Officer stated that new residential developments were required to maintain, provide, and contribute to a mix of tenures, types, and sizes of housing in order to support the creation of mixed, balanced, and inclusive

communities.

Further clarification was provided in respect of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), following comments regarding the application's failure to achieve the full 10 percent. It was stated that the application had originally been submitted in 2022 with a determination date of November 2022, as such, it had preceded both Policy S61 and the statutory requirement for 10 percent BNG.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for her comments and reiterated that only the Members that were present at both the previous Planning Committee meeting on 25 June 2025, and the 11 July 2025 site visit, would be eligible to vote on the item.

The floor was then opened for further discussion. A Member of the Committee drew particular attention to a grouping of trees located at the northeastern end of the proposed development. It was considered important that this area be retained as a buffer zone, and it was noted that several trees within this group were protected under Tree Preservation Order (TPO) designations.

Attention was then drawn by the Committee Member to the comments made by the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust concerning hedgehog access between gardens. It had been noted that several garden boundaries within the proposal did not include hedgehog passes. Reference was made to existing conditions requiring surveys for badgers and otters, and it was formally proposed that an additional condition be added to ensure the inclusion of hedgehog passes in all gardens, given the importance of maintaining safe movement routes.

The proposed elevation of the development site away from the Foss Dyke Canal was welcomed. In the context of global warming and increased flood risk, it was considered important that the site had been raised from its previous classification of Flood Zone 3 to Flood Zone 1, thereby offering improved protection against future flooding.

Councillor Smith then addressed the Committee. It was noted that he had been unable to attend the site visit due to a longstanding personal engagement. However, it was confirmed that he had been present at both meetings and had listened to the discussions with interest. Reference was made to earlier applications and to the technical errors that had led to the current situation. It was stated that, ideally, the matter would not have come before the Committee, and the need to ensure such administrative issues were avoided in future was emphasised. The Committee Member urged Members of the Committee to consider the impact of the proposed development and stated that the extant scheme presented less of a harm to current residents and occupiers.

A question was raised by a Member of the Committee regarding the management of open spaces within the proposed development. Reference was made to ongoing concerns about transparency and accountability in management arrangements. In response, it was confirmed by the Officer that no details regarding the future management company had yet been provided. It was explained that arrangements for the management and maintenance of open space would be secured via a Section 106 legal agreement.

The Chairman referred to the 11 July 2025 site visit, during which Officers had been asked to address flood risk concerns, which the Chairman felt had been sufficiently addressed. It was stated that Members of the Committee had viewed substantial areas of mature

vegetation, with much of it in full leaf in July. However, it was confirmed that much of the area was not protected, with the exception of designated TPO zones, and that the extant permission could permit the removal of vegetation within unprotected areas. The Chairman continued, noting that the site visit had enabled views of the lodges through the trees and included observation of the tree preservation area, access gates, and the northern lodge site located beyond the TPO boundaries. Members of the Committee were asked during the visit whether any additional matters required consideration, and it was agreed that the visit had provided a comprehensive overview of the site's context. Therefore, the Chairman proposed to accept the recommendations outlined in the Officer's report, with the addition of the proposed amendment to include hedgehog passes in all gardens.

A Member of the Committee made a query regarding the unadopted access road. In response, the Officer clarified that any damage to the road during construction would be a matter for resolution between the landowner and the owner of the road. It was explained that from a Highways perspective, the road was deemed to be of an acceptable standard, although ownership of the access route lay with a separate party and had been acknowledged through the signing of Certificate B. The Committee Member requested that the developer be asked to liaise with the landowner to ensure that any necessary remedial works were undertaken upon completion of development; the Officer confirmed that an informative note could be added to the decision notice to reflect this.

The Committee Member expressed frustration that no stipulation had been made regarding occupancy for residents over the age of 55, although appreciation was expressed for the Applicant's response to flooding concerns. Sympathy was conveyed towards local residents, though it was acknowledged that planning regulations must be adhered to in determining the outcome. It was highlighted that refusal of the application would likely result in an appeal, which could impose financial costs on ratepayers.

A Member of the Committee expressed concern over the proportionality of the development. It was stated that although approval for up to 100 dwellings was acknowledged, the predominance of larger house types over smaller units was viewed as disproportionate.

With no further comments, and having been proposed and seconded, with the amendment of an additional condition requiring a site plan for hedgehog passes noted, upon taking the vote, it was

RESOLVED that approval to **GRANT** planning permission be delegated back to Officers subject to conditions, with the additional condition requiring a site plan for hedgehog passes to be agreed, and the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement that secured:

- NHS Contribution of £41,745;
- The inclusion of a Viability Clause to detail a mechanism within the S106 legal agreement to request that an assessment of costs and values towards the end of the development is carried out to see if there is scope to make a commuted sum contribution toward affordable housing. The clause will also ensure a full viability assessment is carried out in relation to any variations (Section 73 Applications) made to the scheme.
- Open Space and Landscaping- Details of future management and maintenance.

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. Prior to any development a scheme for on-site foul water drainage works, including connection point and discharge rate, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Prior to the occupation of any phase, the foul water drainage works relating to that phase must have been carried out in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure the development is served by an acceptable foul water drainage system in accordance with Policy S21 of the CLLP and the NPPF.

3. No development, including any site clearance shall take place until the results of the further Otter survey as detailed within Section 5 of the Badger and Otter Survey Report dated April 2024 by Kedd Limited. Details of any mitigation measures shall also be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only proceed in accordance with the approved mitigation plan.

Reason: In the interests of protected species in accordance with Policy S60 of the CLLP 2023 and the NPPF.

4. No development, including any site clearance shall take place until a reptile mitigation plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be prepared in accordance with mitigation recommendations contained within Section 6 of the Reptile Survey Report dated April 2024 by Kedd Limited. The development shall only proceed in accordance with the approved mitigation plan.

Reason: In the interests of protected species in accordance with Policy S60 of the CLLP 2023 and the NPPF.

5. No development hereby permitted shall take place until a Construction Management Plan and Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan and Statement shall indicate measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of vehicle activity and the means to manage the drainage of the site during the construction stage of the permitted development. It shall include;

- the phasing of the development to include access construction;
- the on-site parking of all vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- the on-site loading and unloading of all plant and materials;
- the on-site storage of all plant and materials used in constructing the development.
- wheel washing facilities;
- the routes of construction traffic to and from the site including any off-site routes for the

disposal of excavated material.

The development shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan and Methods Statement.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and the safety and free passage of those using the adjacent public highway the permitted development during construction, in accordance with Policy S47 and S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, and the provisions of the NPPF.

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

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:

Site Location Plan 1621-01 Rev A
Landscape Layout (April 2024) KD.BRTW.D.001A
Planning Layout (1:500) | 1621-02 - Rev S
Planning Layout (1:1000) | 1621-54 - Rev C
Pedestrian & Vehicle Movement Plan | 1621-03 - Rev E
Landscape Management & Maintenance Plan | 1621-04 - Rev F
Refuse Vehicle Tracking Plan | 1621-06 - Rev E
Material Finishes Layout | 1621-08 - Rev E
Boundary Treatments Layout | 1621-09 - Rev E
Ecological Enhancement Plan | 1621-10 - Rev E
Parking Strategy Layout | 1621-11 - Rev E
Tree Protection Plan | 1621-55 - Rev C
FVA Area Plan | 1621-65 - Rev B
ASHP & PV Panel Locations | 1621-66
Typical Street Scenes (Sheet 1 of 3) | 1621-12 - Rev F
Typical Street Scenes (Sheet 2 of 3) | 1621-13 - Rev F
Typical Street Scenes (Sheet 3 of 3) | 1621-14 - Rev F
Site Sections (Sheet 1 of 2) | 1621-15 - Rev F
Site Sections (Sheet 2 of 2) | 1621-56 - Rev B
House Type 3D9 - M4(2) - (as) | 1621-23 - Rev B
House Type 3D9 - M4(2) - (opp) | 1621-24 - Rev B
House Type 3D9 - M4(2) CLAD (as) | 1621-60 - Rev A
House Type 4D48 (as) | 1621-25
House Type 4D36G (as) | 1621-29 - Rev A
House Type 4D36G (opp) | 1621-30 - Rev A
House Type 4D36S (as) | 1621-31 - Rev A
House Type 4D36S (opp) | 1621-32 - Rev A
House Type 4D36S CLAD | 1621-59
House Type 4D52 (as) | 1621-33
House Type 4D52 (opp) | 1621-34 - Rev A
House Type 2B4 (as) | 1621-45
House Type 2B4 (opp) | 1621-46
House Type 3B17 (as) | 1621-47
House Type 3B17 (opp) | 1621-48
House Type 4D50 (as) | 1621-57

House Type 4D50 (opp) | 1621-49 - Rev A
House Type 4D32 (as) | 1621-50 - Rev A
House Type 4D32 (opp) | 1621-51 - Rev A
House Type 4D32 CLAD | 1621-61
House Type 4D32 CLAD | 1621-62
House Type 4D20 - M4(2) - (as) | 1621-52 - Rev C
House Type 4D20 - M4(2) - (opp) | 1621-53 - Rev C
House Type 4D20 - M4(2) CLAD (as) | 1621-63 - Rev A
Single Garage | 1621-39 - Rev A
Double Garage | 1621-40 - Rev A
2 Car Garage | 1621-41 - Rev A
900mm High Native Species Hedgerow | 1621-44
1.2m High Palisade Fence Detail | 1621-58
1.5m High Panel Fence with 300mm Gravel Board | 1621-42
High Brick Screen Wall Detail | 1621-43 - 1.8m
Proposed Contouring | 202.DR.002 Revision B
Cut and Fill Exercise | 202.DR.001 Revision C
Cross Sections | 202.DR.004

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.

7.The development hereby approved must only be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out in sections 3 and 4 of Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) completed by Kedd Limited dated May 2023.

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.

8.No development above damp-proof course level shall commence until a detailed scheme for the disposal of surface water based on the principles as set out in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall proceed in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the development is served by an appropriate surface water drainage scheme in accordance with Policy S21 of the CLLP and the NPPF.

9.No occupation of any dwelling shall occur until the ecological enhancements as shown on plan ref 1621-10 Rev B have been implemented and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of protected species and enhancing the biodiversity of the site in accordance with Policies S60 and S61 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and the NPPF.

10. Notwithstanding the mitigation plans detailed within conditions 4 and 5 of this consent. The development shall proceed in accordance with the ecological recommendations

contained within the following reports;

- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) by Kedd Limited dated May 2023
- Bat Survey Report (April 2024)

Reason: In the interests of protected species and enhancing the biodiversity of the site in accordance with Policies S60 and S61 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and the NPPF.

11.No development above damp-proof course level shall take place until details, including specifications of all the proposed facing materials to be used in the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only proceed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity to accord with Policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

12.No occupation of each individual dwelling must take place until its individual access and driveway identified on Proposed Site Plan: 1621-54 - Rev C has been fully completed and retained for that use thereafter.

Reason: To ensure safe access to the site and each dwelling in the interests of residential amenity, convenience and safety, and to allow vehicles to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety to accord with Policy S47 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

13. 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.

14.Prior to occupation of the approved dwellings, 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.

15.The development hereby approved must only be carried out in accordance with the tree protection measures set out in the Arboricultural Assessment, Tree Protection Plan 1621-55 - Rev C completed by Kedd Limited. The tree protection measures as shown on plan reference 1621-55 Rev C shall be erected and retained in their position prior to and for the duration of the construction works.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure all parties are aware of the approved operations, whilst ensuring the continued well-being of the trees in the interest of the amenity of the locality in accordance with Policy S66 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, and the provisions of the NPPF.

16. The development hereby permitted shall proceed in accordance with the Amended Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment and Metric dated April 2024.

Reason: To ensure the development delivers the on-site Biodiversity Net Gain in accordance with Policy S61 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

17. No development, apart from site clearance shall occur, until an external lighting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of nature conservation in accordance with policies S53 and S60 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

18. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accordance with the details set out in the submitted Amended Sustainability Statement dated September 2024, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

19. Prior to occupation of the buildings, 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 September 2024, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with the provisions of Policies S6 and S7 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

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

20. The scheme of landscaping as detailed on plan reference KD.BRTW.D.001A 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.

21. 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 domestic oil tanks or domestic gas tanks shall be placed within the curtilage of the dwellings hereby approved.

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

25 WL/2025/00182 - RPC CONTAINERS LTD, GALLAMORE LANE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, MARKET RASEN

Members gave consideration to the second application on the agenda, application number WL/2025/00182, seeking planning permission for four silos, on land at RPC Containers Ltd, Gallamore Lane Industrial Estate, Market Rasen. The Officer explained that report had been updated to incorporate appropriate location assessments submitted by the Applicant, alongside updated information regarding landscaping proposals. A presentation was then given outlining the location and key features of the proposed development. It was noted that the scheme would necessitate road widening due to the positioning of the new southern silo, in order to maintain vehicular access around the rear of the industrial facility.

The Officer gave an overview of the proposed site, highlighting location, elevations and proposed silo locations. Since the previous Committee meeting, the Officer stated that a landscaping mitigation plan had been submitted, providing additional visual screening at a height of 1.8-2 metres for the southern silos. An alternative location plan had also been submitted by the Applicant, indicating various possible positions for the silos, as outlined in the report.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his presentation and stated that there were three registered speakers; the first speaker, Mr Alan Scoffin, as Agent, was invited to address the Committee.

Mr Scoffin acknowledged that the concerns raised by local residents regarding noise levels, visual impact, and site traffic were fully appreciated. It was stated that a careful review of the concerns had been undertaken in consultation with the Planning Officer, with measures put in place to address the issues appropriately.

The Agent explained that the proposed silos were considered critical infrastructure necessary to support an imminent customer project. Due to the volume of material anticipated on site, it was highlighted that bulk storage was deemed the only feasible solution, as manual handling risks would be considered too high. It was noted that, in the absence of the installation, the viability of the project and visibility of the site's future would have been jeopardised.

Mr Scoffin explained that the site currently provided employment for 125 individuals. The proposal had been selected on the basis of existing infrastructure, energy efficiency, and minimised noise and traffic impact.

The Agent assured the Committee that alternative locations for the silos had been assessed, and a site plan with markers of these potential locations was presented to the Committee. It was explained that the alternative locations were dismissed for a variety of reasons and each dismissed location was addressed in turn. The reasons outlined were respectively, prohibitive costs due to the absence of infrastructure; increased traffic past residential properties, particularly from forklift trucks; the obstruction of key road access and associated health and safety risks; issues related to the transfer of materials to the production building; limitations on future warehouse projects; the removal of parking spaces in already limited

areas; and finally, permanently increased energy usage and noise levels due to material transfer distances.

With regard to resident concerns, Mr Scoffin confirmed that the submitted installation would not result in increased forklift traffic or general vehicle movement in proximity to neighbouring properties. It was explained that material offloads on the southeast corner would remain in their current position, with only a modest increase of one to two deliveries per week. These deliveries would continue to occur strictly between 7.00 a.m. and 7.00 p.m., Monday to Friday. Mr Scoffin clarified that forklift trucks were not involved in the movement of silo materials, rendering related concerns unfounded. The Agent confirmed that following a plant noise assessment, the Officer's report concluded that the silos, together with the limited additional deliveries, would not give rise to unacceptable noise pollution.

Regarding surface water runoff, Mr Scoffin reported that the proposal would not increase the area which was currently positively drained to the dyke. It was noted that Amcor had recently carried out clearance of the dyke and expressed willingness to continue. However, it was noted that downstream clearance fell under the responsibility of others, as per riparian ownership regulations.

The Agent concluded by stating that the concerns of neighbours had been listened to carefully, and that meaningful steps had been taken to mitigate visual and auditory impact. A scheme of dense planting had been developed in collaboration with the Local Planning Authority, which was intended to serve as a visual and acoustic barrier along the site boundary. The proposal was described as striking a balance between operational necessity and community considerations. Confidence was expressed that the chosen plan minimised disruption, respected neighbour concerns, and supported the sustainable future of the site as a significant local employer.

The Chairman thanked Mr Scoffin for his comments and invited the second registered speaker, Mrs Karen Dowle, as Objector, to address the Committee.

Mrs Dowle began by highlighting that at the conclusion of the 25 June 2025 Planning Committee meeting, it had been stated that the planning application under consideration must be acceptable to both parties. It was expressed that disappointment had been felt upon review of the documentation available on the public portal, as no apparent changes had been identified. It was claimed that due diligence had not been demonstrated by Amcor in their submission and it had been hoped that a meeting would be arranged to allow concerns to be discussed.

Mrs Dowle explained that the rear building of RPC had been constructed in the year 2000, specifically for use as a warehouse and had not been intended to accommodate heavy machinery. At that time, RPC had also diverted the nearby dyke via a culvert, which had previously reached the corner of a neighbouring property, past the south side of the building, under the bank, flowing through to a nearby park.

Significant concerns had been raised regarding the proposal to site silos on the south side of the building. It was explained that the wall foundations extended further than anticipated, necessitating that the silos be positioned at a greater distance from the structure. This adjustment would have required the road to be widened and the bank to be pushed further back, thereby increasing the risk of damage to surrounding trees and raising the possibility of impact to the culvert system, which had been questioned in terms of its present condition.

Images of the dyke were presented to the Committee, reportedly showing that clearance had not been undertaken since 2022, when an overflow event had resulted in flooding at the speaker's property. A major cleaning effort had been carried out by RPC at that time; however, no subsequent maintenance had been observed before or after. Additional images had illustrated the dyke under dry conditions, revealing the culvert's grill, followed by images taken after rainfall, prompting queries regarding the culvert's functionality. It was noted that surface water from the factory's rear section was directed into gullies leading to recurring flooding in the area, which Mrs Dowle stated needed to be addressed by Amcor.

It was maintained that only the west or north side of the site would be acceptable for future silo installations due to the impact of existing silos and questions were asked regarding Amcor's dismissal of alternative silo sites. With regard to moving the road further into the industrial estate, it was asserted that this would be dangerous for local residents.

The Committee were given documentation from 2004, supplied by Mrs Dowle, showing that the original silo application had been overturned by the Council, resulting in the silos being placed on the south side, with further installations had occurring in 2018. Reference was made to a 2003 landscaping plan involving trees, shrubs, and bushes that had reportedly never been planted. A request was therefore made for a new and varied selection of greenery to be introduced to reduce visual impact and noise levels from the existing silos.

Aside from the initial silos installed in 2004, it was claimed that the facility had previously operated as a quiet warehouse. However, it was stated that disturbances had increased in recent years, with notable thudding and vibrations arising from machinery. Mrs Dowle referenced disturbances to neighbouring properties due to vibration, and it was suggested that damage to residential properties may have already occurred. The speech concluded with Mrs Dowle asking Amcor to demonstrate integrity and act responsibly in relation to its neighbours.

The Chairman thanked Mrs Dowle for her comments and invited the third registered speaker, Cllr Bunney, as Ward Member, to address the Committee.

Cllr Bunney introduced himself as a Ward Member who served on West Lindsey District Council, Market Rasen Town Council, and Lincolnshire County Council. The Ward Member began by expressing concern regarding the absence of correspondence or communication between residents and the factory. It was suggested that decisions appeared to have been influenced predominantly by cost considerations rather than by a commitment to compromise or community agreement.

Cllr Bunney stated that the drainage system continued to pose significant problems, particularly for adjacent recreational areas. It was recommended that formal arrangements be implemented to ensure the ongoing maintenance of the dyke, culvert and drainage system.

The Ward Member reiterated concerns regarding noise, vibration, the visual impact from the site. It was emphasised that any additional silos should be located to minimise disruption to those living nearby. Matters relating to landscaping were also addressed, and it was observed that previous planting, including silver birch trees had not provided an effective year-round screen.

Reference was made to earlier remarks regarding sustainability and the need for rigorous

assessment of the proposal. While it had been acknowledged that Market Rasen constituted an industrial area in part, attention was drawn to the responsibility of planners and developers to accommodate the needs of the residential population. A request was made by Cllr Bunney for the Committee to bear in mind the presence of affected residents throughout all stages of the planning process and to prioritise proper communication and consultation going forward.

The Chairman thanked Cllr Bunney for his comments and invited a response from the Officer.

The Officer clarified that responsibility for facilitating discussions between Amcor and residents would be a matter for those two parties directly.

Regarding drainage, the Officer stated that the proposed development would not increase surface water runoff, and a storm drain system was confirmed to be in place, directing water to the dyke. It was confirmed that the Applicant had acknowledged partial responsibility for the maintenance of the dyke, and within their application, had indicated that clearance works had been undertaken in 2022 and that ongoing monitoring was being conducted.

In relation to landscaping and trees, it had been noted that no protected trees existed on the site. Discussions with the Tree and Landscape Officer had taken place, and it had been agreed that the focus of mitigation should be on providing screening below the tree canopies, and appropriate tree species and heights had been confirmed.

Concerning noise, the Officer highlighted that reports had been conducted and had demonstrated that the anticipated impact from both the proposed works and the operation of the silos would be minimal.

The Chairman explained that at the previous meeting on 25 June 2025, a request had been made for the Applicant to investigate alternate silo locations on the site. It had been confirmed that information relating to this request had been submitted, including a location plan outlining possible alternatives. It was added that justifications had been provided to explain the preference for the proposed location, although cost had not been cited, as this was not a planning consideration.

In response to comments regarding historic planning decisions on the site from a Member of the Committee, the Officer clarified that the role of the Committee was to determine the application before them, specifically in terms of whether the chosen location would cause significant harm. Responding to a question about conditioning the maintenance of the dyke, the Officer advised that such a condition would not meet the six statutory tests required for planning conditions and would be deemed unreasonable. Officers noted that enforcement procedures already allowed site access for investigations at any time should issues arise, rendering an annual inspection unnecessary.

A Member of the Committee reiterated the Officer's comments, noting the difficulties with potentially enforcing the maintenance of dyke. On the basis of what had been presented by all parties, the Committee Member did not believe there was a sufficient argument to refuse planning permission. Therefore, a proposal was made to accept the Officer's recommendation as outlined in the report. Other Committee Members concurred, adding that consideration should be given to the financial implications of such a refusal, with

recognition that offering false hope to residents in the long-term would not be appropriate.

Before closing the discussion, it had been emphasised that although a formal condition could not be imposed regarding regular maintenance of the dyke, the Applicant should be made aware that the matter had been raised and discussed by the Committee. It was agreed that the Officer would add an advisory note in relation to monitoring and maintaining the dyke to the east of the site.

Having been proposed and seconded, upon taking the vote it was 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 must be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To conform with Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

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

NONE

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

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

- RD:5785/01 dated 18th December 2024 – Site Plans (Proposed Only)
- RD:5785/02 dated 4th January 2018 – Elevation Plans (Proposed Only)
- RD:5785/04 Rev B dated 14th July 2025 – Site Plan
- RD:5785/05 dated 18th December 2024 – Road Widening Plans

The works must be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans and in any other approved documents forming part of the application.

Reason: To ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the approved plans and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Policy S1, S31, S47, S49 and S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023-2043.

3. The proposed development must be completed in strict accordance with the landscaping details identified on site plan RD:5785/04 Rev B dated 14th July 2025.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate landscaping is introduced and would provide effective additional soft landscape screening to the nearby residents to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policies S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

Conditions which apply or relate to matters which are to be observed following

completion of the development:

4. No deliveries to the silos hereby approved must take place between the hours of 19.00-8.00 on a Monday to Friday or on a Saturday, Sunday or Bank Holiday.

Reason: To preserve residential amenity to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023-2043.

5. All planting comprised in the approved details of landscaping (see condition 3 of this permission) must be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased must be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. The landscaping should be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that additional trees are provided within the site to mitigate for the trees which are to be removed to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policies S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

Advisory Note:

Drainage and Flood Risk

It is advised that the occupying business monitor and maintain the dyke adjacent to the east of the site (which is within their responsibility) to a standard that allows water to properly flow and liaise with neighbouring residents whenever relevant.

26 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS

With no comments, questions or requirement for a vote, the Determination of Appeals report was **NOTED**.

The meeting concluded at 8.04 pm.

Chairman