

## WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held in The Council Chamber - The Guildhall on 12 December 2018 commencing at 6.30 pm.

**Present:** Councillor Ian Fleetwood (Chairman)  
Councillor Owen Bierley (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Matthew Boles (up to item 63)  
Councillor David Cotton  
Councillor Michael Devine  
Councillor Giles McNeill  
Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne  
Councillor Roger Patterson  
Councillor Mrs Judy Rainsforth  
Councillor Thomas Smith  
Councillor Robert Waller

**In Attendance:**

Oliver Fytche-Taylor	Planning & Development Manager
George Backovic	Principal Development Management Officer
Russell Clarkson	Development Management Team Leader
Martin Evans	Senior Development Management Officer
Richard Green	Planning Officer
Martha Rees	Legal Advisor
James Welbourn	Democratic and Civic Officer

**Also in attendance:** 37 members of the public

**Apologies:** None were received.

### 57 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

There was no public participation.

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

Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 14 November 2018.

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 14 November 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

### 59 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Jessie Milne declared an interest in application 138145, Holywell Grange Snitterby, as a member of the public had contacted her in her capacity as Secretary to Sir

Edward Leigh MP.

This did not preclude her from speaking or voting on this item.

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

There was no update on Government/Local changes in Planning policy.

## **61 138618 - DAWN HILL LANE, HEMSWELL, GAINSBOROUGH DN21 5UH**

The Principal Development Management Officer introduced application number 138618, an application for a single storey rear extension at 11 Dawnhill Lane, Hemswell, Gainsborough DN21 5UH.

It was confirmed that the Highways department had stated no objection to the proposals.

The application was proposed, seconded and voted upon and approved unanimously.

It was therefore **AGREED** that the application be **GRANTED**, subject to conditions.

## **62 138441 - LAND EAST OF A1133 NEWTON ON TRENT LN1 2GJ**

The next item was application number 138441, an application for change of use of existing building and adjoining land to commercial use at Land East of A1133 Newton on Trent, Lincoln, Lincolnshire LN1 2GJ.

There were no updates from Planning Officers at this point.

The first speaker on the item was Mr Nick Grace, agent for the applicant. He raised the following points:

- RSM undertook agricultural and highways verge maintenance, contract work, and had diversified over time;
- There was a need to permanently operate on site;
- There had been no objections from third parties to this application;
- The site was ideally suited for its rural activity;
- The growth team at West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) supported continued activity at the site. It was considered a sustainable location for the company's operation, and growth;
- Paragraphs 83 and 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) applied to this application, regarding supporting a 'prosperous rural economy';
- Regarding the applicant potentially having time to relocate to another site, this was considered to 'fly in the face' of the NPPF as decisions should enable the growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas through the conversion of existing

buildings;

- A temporary permission was seeking to force an existing business out of an established site and into a site being developed by WLDC; that site would not be fit for purpose due to size;
- Many local people rely on RSM for work; relocation would have significant implications for the business, and there would be the loss of local jobs;
- Respectfully ask for full planning permission to ensure the long term viability of this flagship local rural business.

Following this, Councillor Stuart Kinch spoke as the Ward Member for the application. He highlighted the following points:

- The business had been broken into several times;
- It would be very difficult to relocate the business for cost reasons. The number of people employed were 12 full-time staff, and 5 part-time staff; rural businesses are few and far between;
- The growth team at WLDC fully supported this application;
- Cllr Kinch urged committee to debate the item thoroughly with a view to passing the application.

**Note:** Following his speech, Councillor Kinch left the Chamber.

Members then debated the application; following consultation with officers, the following points were raised:

- The application was supported by the community and had no objections;
- The business had been operating in its current location for a long period of time;
- No alternative access to the site had been proposed;
- There was an opportunity with a temporary permission to find an alternative location that was compliant with the Local Plan (i.e. an allocated site); planners were not seeking to direct the applicant to a specific site;
- Temporary planning permissions can be granted for longer than a year, but these lengths of time would be subject to a reasonableness test;
- Paragraphs 83 and 84 of the NPPF could be appropriately applied to the application as it was contributing substantially to the local community in terms of jobs.

An amendment to the application was proposed, seconded and voted upon and approved; the amendment removed the temporary 12 month permission stipulation in the report.

It was therefore **AGREED** that full planning permission be **GRANTED**, subject to conditions.

### **63 137789 IRWIN ROAD, BLYTON**

The Senior Development Management Officer introduced application number 137789, an outline planning application for up to 9no. dwellings with all matters reserved at Land East of Laughton Road, adjacent to Irwin Road, Blyton.

There was no planning officer update on this item.

The first speaker on this item was Councillor Mark Harrison of Blyton Parish Council, who raised the following points:

- The development would be using existing drainage on Irwin Road, which would overload a system which was not suitable in the first place;
- The area of the application was a flow risk; more and more planning applications were being put forward and approved, but the dykes remain of the same size and condition and were very rarely maintained;
- In 2007 the dykes hadn't been maintained for 40 years;
- The drains in the village remain broken and disconnected;
- There was a total disconnect between Planning, and other areas such as Highways. When people have a problem in the village, there was no money to fix an antiquated system;
- When it rained hard the dykes were overflowing into the beer garden of one of the village pubs;
- The sewers were not coping with the foul water and sewerage on Irwin Road;
- There needed to be consistency with how costs were distributed on the access road; some houses did not currently contribute to the cost of the upkeep of the road.

The next speaker was Mr Philip Marris, the applicant. He raised the following points in respect of the application;

- All issues with the proposal had been addressed to a satisfactory level in accordance with local and national planning policies. The Planning Officer's report demonstrates this, and gives good clear reasoning. The number and location of the dwellings was acceptable in principle;
- The impact on potential mineral resources was acceptable;
- The impact on highway safety and convenience was acceptable;

- There were no open space requirements from the proposal;
- There was no harm to amenities or ecology arising out of the proposal;
- A foul and water drainage solution exists; there were no technical problems with the application;
- There was no Neighbourhood Plan for Blyton;
- Objections had been listened to and relevant documents produced. History showed that the applicant had listened to WLDC's guidance; evidenced by the number of time extensions agreed with WLDC;
- All of the objections raised were from Irwin Road residents, and not the wider community;
- It was requested that the committee approve the application.

The third speaker was Marcus Walker, an objector to the application. He raised the following points;

- This application had been received before, and was the same arable field tagged onto the edge of the village on a steep hill, which abutted the residents of Irwin Road;
- There had been two studies; one on the sequential test, and the other being on a potential future solution to the drainage problems. A potential future solution to the drainage was insufficient, as the lives of Irwin Road residents were affected directly by this;
- Opposition to this development was staggering and overwhelming in Blyton; no-one in support of the application could be found. Two Ward Members were against the application;
- There had been flooding in the past, and no more was desired in the future;
- Irwin Road was a small estate of 52 houses and flats; 66 residents had signed a petition against the application;
- Irwin Road was built 13 years ago with sub-standard drainage; the sewer remains unadopted and was in a poor state;
- When the estate was built it was conditioned to have hedgerows, subject to a management fee. These would be destroyed if the development went ahead;
- The highway was five metres wide upon entering the estate; there was a huge problem with car parking;
- The site was unsustainable; it was 1 kilometre from the nearest shop and school. It did not provide affordable housing;

- The application should not be granted.

The final speaker was Councillor Lesley Rollings, one of the Ward Members for Scotter and Blyton, who raised the following points:

- The drains cannot cope in the area;
- The development sought to add to a housing development on Irwin Road that was still unadopted; the residents believe that the developer had walked away;
- Anglian Water did not have to comment on applications of less than ten houses;
- It was understood that Severn Trent Water had not responded to requests to comment on the application even though they had been contacted several times;
- It was not clear what the application would add to the village of Blyton;
- The village received no section 106 payments;
- The pavement leading from Irwin Road was very narrow and caused problems, with an example being people with pushchairs;
- Lincolnshire County Council deals with the rise in water levels. It was not acceptable to be approving 'bolt-on' developments;
- Committee were urged to reject the application in light of the problems with flooding in the village, and because nothing will be added to the village by this application.

**Note:** Following her speech, Councillor Rollings left the Chamber.

Members then had the opportunity to provide comment, and also ask questions of the Senior Development Management Officer. Further information was provided, as below:

- The lead local flood authority had been consulted, and following amendments to the drainage strategy, they were satisfied it would be possible to drain the surface water from the site in an appropriate manner; this could be via infiltration to the ground, or through the watercourse to the south-west of the site;
- Severn Trent Water had not objected to the application on the grounds of foul water drainage; it would always be possible to upgrade sewerage infrastructure. If, in time, the sewers were adopted by Severn Trent, they could be updated by Severn Trent's legal process;
- There was no requirement for Severn Trent to respond to the application;
- The eventual layout of the site could be changed; a new condition had been attached to the application which would consider a wholesale look at the surface and foul water drainage;

- Surface water from this development would not drain into the adjacent estate; a soakaway test had been done by the applicant, and this was successful;
- According to government guidance, Infiltration and soakaways were the preferred method of sustainable drainage, followed by discharge into an existing watercourse, and then existing sewer capacity;
- Comments from the Environmental Protection Officer were overcome by the latest submitted drainage comments;
- The site was located on grade 3 agricultural land. LP55 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) supported the officer's view that the site was outside of the footprint of the village of Blyton;

**Note:** Councillor Matt Boles left the meeting at 1924 and did not return.

- LP4 of the CLLP does permit development of greenfield land and was acceptable as a matter of principle. It was considered that the site passed the sequential test provided by LP4, and would result in the loss of a very small parcel of grade 3 agricultural land.

The opportunity to undertake a site visit was proposed, seconded and voted upon and approved.

A site visit was therefore **AGREED**, with a time and date to be decided by Members for the earliest available date.

**Note:** The meeting was adjourned at 1929.

#### **64 138145 - HOLYWELL GRANGE, SNITTERBY DN21 4UH**

**Note:** The meeting reconvened at 1933, and all Members present at the start of the meeting were present, with the exception of Councillor Matt Boles.

The Principal Development Management Officer introduced application number 138145, an application for change of use of land for the siting of 84no. chalet lodge units, with 3no. additional lodges for use as site manager's accommodation, multi-functional space and a reception manager's office Holywell Grange, Moor Road, Snitterby Gainsborough DN21 4UH.

There were a number of updates for this item, as follows:

- The final comments from the Highways department had been received , recommending imposition of conditions relating to:
  - the provision of a proposed 1.5 m footway;
  - prohibition of site occupation until implementation of Travel Plan;
  - Implementation of an approved surface water drainage scheme;
  - Prohibition of development until submission and subsequent approval of a

Construction Management Plan and Method Statement. This to be strictly adhered to throughout construction;

- 3 additional objections to the proposal since the report had been prepared on the perceived lack of capacity for the drainage that had been put forward, and concerns it would drain onto other people's land. It was noted by the PDMO that no objections were raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority to the proposal;
- There had been a response from the applicant and agent on proposed changes to the scheme since the report had been prepared, relating to the reduction in the number of lodges (either 82, or 75).

They had also submitted a "rebuttal" to the comments of WLDC's Landscape Officer. This had been assessed together with proposed revised layouts by the Landscape Officer who confirmed that it did not alter her conclusions and objections to the scheme;

- There had been a detailed response from the applicant's heritage adviser in relation to the comments of the conservation officer on the impact on Holywell Grange, a Grade II listed building. There is a difference of opinion between the two and reference was made to a detailed response from the conservation officer. On the whole the impact was considered "less than substantial" and weighed against approval detracting from the benefits to the tourism economy.

The first of the speakers was Kate Hiseman, the agent for the applicants. She raised the following points:

- The proposal contributes to visitor shortfall in the WLDC area. It was recognised that the provision of quality accommodation was important for sustainable development in the District;
- Families and couples would buy lodges and use them as a retreat;
- It could be used by those who have long-term health issues;
- A diverse tourism offer would contribute to sustainability in the area;
- Visit England reported that 400,000 residents with an impairment did not take a holiday in the previous year;
- There was support from a national chiropractor and wellness clinic searching for sites in the UK; the nearest equivalent was in Thirsk;
- All objections were based on the assumption that the scheme submitted would fail; no-one had challenged the Business Plan. The lodges would only be in position once sold;
- The applicant had 30 years' experience in the caravan and holiday industry, and was on the committee of the Caravan Club that wrote the code of practice for the siting

and transportation of caravans and lodges. He had been contacted by them to use the site as an example nationally;

- The scheme would deliver significant spin-off expenditure to the local economy, and a sustainable tourism plan was uniquely placed to deliver this;
- It would contribute to £380,000 gross value added per year and offers the opportunity for joint working with communities;
- The scheme aims to create high value tourism jobs;
- The Sustainability Tourism Plan was clear in putting local people first in terms of jobs;
- The sustainability appraisal and planning statement as submitted conform there were no unacceptable adverse impacts on the CLLP or national planning policy;
- The proposal takes a multi-layered view of how tourism can provide benefits, and add to health and wellbeing;
- The development would be for up to 84, high quality detached lodgings, with a mix of sizes, and a site office and café. It would sit within woodland and a wildlife area.

The Principal Development Management Officer advised the committee that the application before them was for holiday lodges; there was nothing before the committee on implementation and delivery of the scheme, which would be something for the future. There were no delivery mechanisms in terms of transport.

The final speaker was Councillor Jeff Summers, Ward Member for the application. He raised the following points;

- The site was in open agricultural land, and was bounded on two sides by a highway. It was on the opposite side to Black Dyke, which runs past Snitterby, forming a natural boundary between the application site and the village. In 2007 this dyke overtopped and house were flooded;
- In no way was the site connected to Snitterby or Waddingham;
- The application did not meet or comply with any of the 15 points in the CLLP at 2.5.2; nor did it meet any of the criteria of LP55 of the same document;
- The inclusion of a shop on the site would do nothing to add to the Public House in Snitterby and the shop in Waddingham; both are struggling somewhat and therefore do not need competition;
- There had been 54 representations from local people opposing the application;
- The main residence was an 18<sup>th</sup> century listed building; wooden lodges crowding the building would not enhance its designation;

- There did not seem to be any justification for sustainability; in recent years a similar application in Caistor that came to committee several times had to be converted into full-time living accommodation;
- The officer recommendation was fully supported.

**Note:** Following his speech, Councillor Summers left the Chamber.

Members then provided comment on the application:

- The transport links in the area were relatively non-existent; the Call-Connect bus would be to Gainsborough or Brigg only;
- Paragraphs 193 and 194 of the NPPF would be covered by LP25 of the CLLP which was in conformity with the NPPF.

There were no further questions or comments and it was therefore moved, seconded and voted upon that permission be **REFUSED**, as per the officer recommendation in the report.

## **65 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS**

The costs for the appeal at Burton were highlighted.

All the appeals were noted.

The meeting concluded at 7.58 pm.

Chairman