

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall on 20 August 2025 commencing at 6.30 pm.

Present: Councillor Ian Fleetwood (Chairman for the meeting)
Councillor John Barrett
Councillor Owen Bierley
Councillor Emma Bailey
Councillor Karen Carless
Councillor David Dobbie
Councillor Roger Patterson
Councillor Tom Smith

In Attendance:
Sally Grindrod-Smith Director Planning, Regeneration & Communities
Russell Clarkson Development Management Team Manager
George Backovic Development Management Team Leader
Martha Rees Legal Advisor
Molly Spencer Democratic & Civic Officer

Also in Attendance: 15 Members of the Public

Apologies: Councillor Matthew Boles
Councillor Paul Swift

Membership: Councillor Emma Bailey was appointed substitute for Councillor Matthew Boles

27 TO OPEN THE MEETING AND APPOINT A CHAIRMAN

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

A Member of the Committee proposed that Councillor Fleetwood be appointed Chairman. The proposal was duly seconded.

As no further nominations were received, and having been voted upon, it was

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

A Member of the Committee stated that, following the previous Full Council meeting, it had been understood that only one round of Committee Meetings would have taken place prior to the next Full Council meeting. The Member of the Committee raised concerns about

continuity in committee membership.

In response, the Chairman acknowledged the point and noted that, due to the volume and time sensitive nature of planning applications, the Planning Committee operated on a more frequent cycle than other committees. It was explained that while most committees typically met four to five times per year, the Planning Committee often convened eleven to twelve times annually, depending on the level of business to be considered.

28 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

There was no public participation.

29 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

With no comments, and having been proposed and seconded, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 23 July 2025 be confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

30 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In relation to application WL/2024/00016, Councillor Smith declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to his employment with Sir Edward Leigh MP, who he explained had commented on the application. It was noted that he had not taken part in any conversations with Sir Edward Leigh regarding the application, nor had he provided any administrative support in relation to the matter as part of his role. Councillor Smith confirmed that they would approach the application with an open mind and would participate in the meeting as a Member of the Committee.

In relation to application WL/2024/00016, Councillor Barrett declared a non-pecuniary interest that the site abutted his ward, encompassing the areas of Nettleham and Riseholme. It was noted that contact had been received from members of the public regarding the application. Councillor Barrett confirmed that no views had been expressed and that all enquiries had been appropriately handled. Councillor Barrett provided assurance that he approached the application with an open mind and would participate in the meeting accordingly.

31 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT/LOCAL CHANGES IN PLANNING POLICY

The Committee was advised by the Development Management Team Manager that no significant planning updates had been issued by central government during since the last meeting of the Planning Committee.

At a local level, it was reported that the Dunholme Neighbourhood Plan had undergone a review and a referendum was held on 24 July 2025. Public support was noted, with approximately 80% voting in favour of adopting the revised plan. It was confirmed that the

plan would carry full weight, subject to ratification at the meeting of Full Council scheduled for 8 September 2025.

Additionally, it was noted that the Saxilby with Ingleby Neighbourhood Plan was currently under review, with a consultation period open until 22 August 2025.

No further updates were provided.

32 WL/2024/00016 - ROADSIDE SERVICES AREA AT JUNCTION OF A15/A46 RISEHOLME ROUNDABOUT

The Development Management Team Leader provided an update to the Committee prior to presenting the application. It was noted that paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework had not been referenced in the original report and was now quoted as follows:

“Planning policies and decisions should recognise the importance of providing adequate overnight lorry parking facilities, taking into account any local shortages to reduce the risk of parking in locations that lack proper facilities or could cause a nuisance. Proposals for new or expanded distribution centres should make provision for sufficient lorry parking to cater for their use.”

The Development Management Team Leader advised that this policy granted positive weight to the application; however, it was not considered sufficient to outweigh the negative impacts identified in the report, including the proposed presence of 31 heavy goods vehicles within the designated green wedge.

Further clarification was provided regarding Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). It was noted that the reported 10.96% increase had been questioned by the applicant, who cited a figure of 15.06%. This was acknowledged as a potential benefit, though again not sufficient to overcome the adverse impacts of the application.

An update was also provided in relation to questions raised by Members at briefing held for Planning Committee, during which concerns had been raised regarding vehicle movements to and from the proposed site. A response from the Local Highways Authority was shared, stating that vehicle swept path analysis had been undertaken to demonstrate that the manoeuvre could be safely executed by the largest vehicles expected to visit the site. It was noted that, during peak times, delays may occur for HGVs attempting to turn right, but this had been accounted for within the internal site layout. It was further advised that rerouting such vehicles would result in an 8km round trip via the Lincolnshire Showground roundabout, impacting all site visitors.

The Development Management Team Leader then proceeded to present the application, once completed the Chairman thanked the Development Management Team Leader for his presentation and noted there were three registered speakers for this application.

The Chairman invited both Councillor Sue North and Councillor Neil Foster to take their seats as Parish Council Representatives as the allocated 5 minutes would be shared between them.

Councillor Neil Foster addressed the Committee on behalf of Burton-by-Lincoln and Riseholme Parish Councils. He acknowledged the presence of members of the public and expressed appreciation for their attendance.

Councillor Foster stated that the application had caused considerable concern and distress among local residents over a two-year period. Support was expressed for the Officer recommendation to refuse planning permission, with reference made to the anticipated harm to the character of Lincoln, the designated green wedge, and the amenity of nearby residents. Councillor Foster urged the Committee to consider highway safety as an additional reason for refusal, citing previous objections from Lincolnshire County Council and concerns regarding the proximity of the proposed junction to a heavily trafficked and high-speed roundabout.

The potential requirement to reduce the speed limit from 70mph to 40mph was described as a significant safety risk, particularly for HGVs. Concerns were also raised regarding pedestrian and cyclist safety, noting that approximately 2,000 homes were within walking distance of the site and that access would require crossing multiple lanes of traffic.

Councillor Foster stated that the development would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and fail to provide safe and convenient access for all, contrary to Policy S47 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. Additional reference was made to Policy S5, which he suggested should be included in the first reason for refusal, and to Policy S35, due to the absence of a sequential test and insufficient information to assess the impact on local service centres.

Councillor Foster concluded by urging the Committee to uphold the officer's recommendation and strengthen it with additional policy grounds relating to highway safety.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Foster for his comments and invited Councillor Sue North to speak for the remainder of the five minutes.

Councillor Sue North reiterated the points raised by Councillor Foster, expressing support for the concerns outlined regarding the planning application. It was stated that the proposal represented the wrong development in the wrong location. No further planning matters were raised.

The Chairman thanked both speakers and invited Councillor Jackie Brockway to speak as County Councillor.

Cllr Jackie Brockway expressed support for the comments made by the previous speakers and extended thanks to the Officer for a well-structured and carefully considered report.

She stated that the application was neither wanted nor needed and emphasised that officer recommendations for refusal, particularly on major applications, were not made lightly. Reference was made to existing nearby facilities, including coffee shops and fuel stations, which were considered sufficient to meet local demand.

Councillor Brockway raised concerns regarding highway safety, particularly the acceleration of vehicles approaching the A15 and the difficulty experienced by residents accessing Riseholme Village. The proposal was described as surplus to requirements, with previous

applications having been refused due to the loss of agricultural land and harm to the green wedge, issues that were considered to remain unresolved.

A 2015 appeal decision was cited, in which the Planning Inspector had concluded that the use of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land had not been justified. It was argued that no substantial evidence of need had been presented and that the development would negatively impact traffic flow and local access.

Councillor Brockway expressed support for the objections raised by the City of Lincoln Council, particularly in relation to the impact on the city's boundaries. She noted that a significant number of objections had been submitted, many of which were based on material planning considerations.

Further concerns were raised regarding infrastructure capacity, with reference to the Environment Agency and Anglian Water. It was noted that in Saxilby, similar capacity issues had resulted in the need to tanker sewage, raising concerns about the ability to manage demand.

In closing, Councillor Brockway queried whether Members of the Committee had received direct communication regarding the application. She concluded by urging the Committee to refuse the application.

The Chairman invited the Development Management Team Leader to respond and he provided clarification regarding highway safety concerns. It was acknowledged that such concerns had generated significant public interest. A direct quote from the report was read aloud, referencing comments from the Local Highways Authority and the Lead Local Flood Authority.

The Development Team Manager Team Leader provided a direct quote from the Local Highways Authority: "In February 2023, the Highway authority and the local Flood Authority recommended that the local planning authority refuse the application on the grounds of inadequate provision for safe and suitable access to the site for pedestrians and cyclists. And the negative impact the development was expected to have upon traffic flows at the Riseholme roundabout. Since this time, the applicant has submitted further technical information and evidence to support the application which addresses these concerns. The site is located directly north of the Riseholme roundabout with vehicular and pedestrian access served up from the A15. Access will be via priority T junction and construction of a ghost island."

Details of the proposed access arrangements were outlined, including a priority T-junction and the construction of a ghost island. The Development Management Team Leader advised that the matter had been thoroughly investigated, including direct representations made by the parish to the Highways Authority. It was emphasised that the original recommendation for refusal had been based on these concerns, and caution was urged in considering the addition of highway safety as a further reason for refusal.

The Development Management Team Leader concluded their remarks, and the Chairman thanked the Development Management Team Leader for the clarification.

The Chairman opened the debate by sharing personal observations of the Riseholme

roundabout during peak traffic, expressing concern over the existing safety conditions. It was noted that the proposed development's proximity to the slip road raised further concerns regarding vehicle access and egress, particularly for HGVs turning right. The potential for conflict between vehicle speed, visibility, and driver frustration was highlighted.

Members of the Committee confirmed an email had been received but Members were clear the content had not been read.

He acknowledged the potential for job creation, referencing a similar development in his ward, but emphasised that highway safety remained a significant concern. The roundabout was described as hazardous even outside peak hours, with poor visibility and high vehicle speeds. It was concluded that, while local employment was important, the cumulative weight of the Development Management Team Leader's reasons for refusal could not be outweighed, and support was expressed for the recommendation to refuse.

Another Member focused on the environmental aspects of the proposal, expressing appreciation for the biodiversity features such as the green roof. However, it was stated that the development was in the wrong location. Emphasis was placed on the importance of preserving the green wedge and supporting objections raised by environmental bodies. The Member of the Committee seconded the motion to refuse the application, citing environmental grounds.

Concerns were raised regarding the absence of a response from Anglian Water, particularly in light of infrastructure issues raised by other Members. While acknowledging the validity of highway safety concerns, it was noted that such matters could be difficult to defend at appeal without enforceable conditions. The Member of the Committee requested the Development Management Team Leader's view on additional policy references raised earlier in the meeting.

During the discussion, the Development Team Leader clarified that Policy S5 (Part E), which related to development in the countryside, had been considered in the report. However, the predominant policy for the site was identified as the green wedge. Following this, Members of the Committee agreed to include Policy S5 as an additional reason for refusal. This was proposed and seconded noting that the site's location and characteristics aligned with the countryside protections outlined in Policy S5.

A Member of the Committee proposed the inclusion of Policy S58 concerning visual impact, noting the distress caused to residents over the two-year duration of the application process. Support was expressed for the Development Management Team Leader's handling of the matter and the protection of the green wedge.

In relation to a query raised by a Member of the Committee the Development Management Team Leader confirmed that Policy S53, relating to design and character, was already included in the second reason for refusal.

A Member of the Committee highlighted the absence of green belt designation in Lincolnshire and the importance of Policy S63 in protecting green wedges. Reference was made to pre-application advice from 2020, which indicated the proposal was unlikely to be supported. The lack of justification for the permanent loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land was also noted.

Support for the recommendation for refusal was stated by another Member of the Committee who raised concerns about the lack of consultation with the Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership, given the site's location on a red route.

The Chairman emphasised the strategic importance of the green wedge in maintaining the rural character of surrounding villages and preventing urban sprawl from Lincoln. The ecological and community value of the area was reiterated.

Having been proposed and seconded, upon taking the vote it was agreed that planning permission be **REFUSED**, with the inclusion of Policy S5 (Part E) as an additional reason, due to the site's location and characteristics being considered inappropriate for countryside development.

33 WL/2025/00550 - FORMER LINDSEY CENTRE, GAINSBOROUGH

The Committee considered an application for the installation of a projector on the redeveloped site of the former Lindsey Centre, facing into the marketplace. The projector, approximately the size of a shoebox, would display symbolic imagery associated with the town's regeneration.

Councillor Dobbie declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to the application, noting that he had been present during discussions at the Town Council. He confirmed that he would consider the application with an open mind and take into account the additional information presented at the meeting. He raised concerns about potential misuse of the projector for political advertising and queried whether restrictions could be applied.

It was clarified by the Lead Officer that the application concerned the physical installation only, and any future use for advertising would be subject to separate regulation under advertisement control.

Members expressed support for the proposal, noting its positive symbolism and contribution to Gainsborough's identity.

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 proposed drawings:
 - J1808-00146 Rev B dated 27th January 2022 – Elevation Plans
 - WT150WR Projector Specification

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

Reason: To ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the approved plans and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, local policy S1, S53, S57 and S58 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023 and NPP6, NPP7, NPP18 and NPP19 of the Gainsborough Town Neighbourhood Plan.

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

3. The projector and cabling hereby approved must be removed from the building within 3 months of its use no longer being required. Any damage to the building must be repaired to match the existing appearance of the brick and mortar.

Reason: To ensure the projector and cabling is removed in a timely manner once its use has become obsolete and to ensure the appearance of the building is retained to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, local policy S53, S57 and S58 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023 and NPP6, NPP7, NPP18 and NPP19 of the Gainsborough Town Neighbourhood Plan.

34 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS

There were no determination of appeals.

The meeting concluded at 7.18 pm.

Chairman