

## **WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL**

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, DN21 2NA on 22 May 2024 commencing at 6.30 pm.

**Present:**

- Councillor Jim Snee (Chairman)
- Councillor Emma Bailey
- Councillor John Barrett
- Councillor Karen Carless
- Councillor David Dobbie
- Councillor Ian Fleetwood
- Councillor Peter Morris
- Councillor Tom Smith
- Councillor Stephen Bunney

**In Attendance:**

Russell Clarkson	Development Management Team Manager
Daniel Galpin	Senior Development Management Officer
Danielle Peck	Senior Development Management Officer
Martha Rees	Legal Advisor
Maisie McInnes	Democratic and Civic Officer

**Apologies:**

- Councillor Matthew Boles
- Councillor Sabastian Hague

### **112 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD**

There were no public speakers.

### **113 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 24 April 2024, be confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

### **114 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Dobbie declared a personal interest in application 148059.

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

Members heard that the scope for agricultural buildings to be converted to residential development, without requiring planning permission ('class Q' developments) was expanded on 21 May 2024. This specified that agricultural buildings could now be converted up to 10 dwellings (previously 5) up to 1000sqm total and have a single storey rear extension (up to 4m). However, the Government has abandoned plans to allow this within protected areas

such as the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB.

**115a 147639 - LAND OFF NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE & WESTMORELAND AVENUE, SCAMPTON**

The Chairman introduced application 147639, to erect 9 dwellings with access to be considered and reserved for subsequent applications, on the land off Northumberland Avenue and Westmoreland Avenue, Scampton. The Planning Officer delivered his presentation and outlined the application for 9 dwellings and displayed the indicative location plan with the layout of housing and displayed photographs of the site.

The Chairman thanked the Planning Officer and advised the Committee there were three registered speakers.

Councillor Chris Bulteel, Scampton Parish Council, objected to the development on the site as the site would be uncoordinated with the existing housing stock, and the proposed site was a current green space for recreational activity. He emphasised the poor condition of the roads and explained there was insufficient infrastructure and access would be via unadopted roads to a single access support. He felt that with the closure of RAF Scampton, there was enough housing supply with vacant military housing coming back into use. He concluded that the Parish Council would have more consideration for the development if the road infrastructure was in place and if there were local amenities in place for residents.

Jadie Jackson spoke on behalf of local residents and explained there had been 46 objections received from residents at RAF Scampton. There were objections due to concerns with congestion on the A15, the limited parking on the site and maintenance of the roads which were already in poor condition with potholes. It was felt that with the additional properties and construction traffic that the roads would fall into further disrepair. There were objections relating to the lack of local amenities, with the school and medical practice both oversubscribed, and 3 miles away from the site and inaccessible without a vehicle. There were concerns regarding drainage and the potential for flooding. Finally, there were objections on nature grounds as there were bats, badgers and red kites on the site and the development would destroy their habitat.

Councillor Roger Patterson, ward member for Scampton, echoed points raised by the previous speakers and explained his reason for objecting was on the grounds that further housing was not required in Scampton. There were no proposals for management companies to be joined up and contribute to the maintenance of facilities or roads. It was difficult for residents to access medical facilities and other amenities and further pressure would be added with the 63 refurbished houses that were being brought back into use from the military.

The Case Officer responded to points raised by the speakers and explained in principle matters, Policy S4 stated that the development met the definition for suitable housing up to 10 dwellings. The grassland did not have any statutory designation for heritage and the development proposed 11% biodiversity net gain and an ecological survey had taken place and conditions would be in place for protected species. In terms of housing mix, the layout and design at the present was indicative and the developer would provide further detail at a later stage. The highway authority had not raised any concerns or objected to the proposed development.

Members discussed the application and raised the following points through the debate:

- Members discussed the impact of traffic, the condition of the roads and asked if the roads had been adopted by Highways. There were concerns regarding road maintenance and pot holes, and the use of construction traffic causing further damage.
- Members questioned whether the existing housing that had been recently refurbished had been taken into account when applying the planning policy.
- Concerns were raised regarding local amenities, infrastructure, and the drainage system. Members urged that adequate drainage would be in place and that planning would work closely with Anglian Water.
- In terms of trees and biodiversity, members expressed concerns regarding the replanting of existing trees and wildlife such as red kites on the site.

The Case Officer responded that the roads off the A15 were not adopted, and Highways had been consulted and expressed no concerns relating to the access. There would be marginal construction traffic movements for the building of the 9 dwellings. The existing settlement had been taken into account as defined in Policy S1. The applicant had provided an ecological assessment which encompassed wild birds as a legally protected species, it was a criminal offence to harm habitats and conditions would be in place to ensure this. It was found that the only nest found on site was a pigeon's nest, and the ecologist did not find any red kites on site.

Members received legal advice that the determination site for the application was tomorrow which would mean members could lose the ability to determine the application if an extension was not granted. Members were reminded that legislation was in place for managing the protection of wildlife, and it would be a criminal offence for any destruction or clearing during nesting season.

Members asked if the planning team could avoid where possible bringing applications to Committee a day before their determination deadline. The Development Management Team Manager explained that it was difficult to determine an application such as this within an 8-week period, and the applicant had a right to non-determination, but the appeal process would take considerably longer.

A Member of the Committee proposed a site visit, in order to view where the development would take place and understand the impact on the local area. This was seconded and upon the vote it was

**RESOLVED** that the application be deferred for a site visit to be held, to afford Members a greater understanding of the potential development site and the impact on the local area.

### **115b 148059 - 16 SILVER STREET, GAINSBOROUGH**

The Committee considered the application seeking planning permission for the conversion of the three floors of 16 Silver Street into three flats. Members heard a presentation from the Case Officer and viewed the existing floorplans of the site.

Planning Committee- 22 May 2024  
Subject to Call-in. Call-in will expire at 5pm on

Members praised the regeneration work and felt it was great to see buildings being brought back into use in the town centre. Members asked if there were any parking spaces with the application and it was confirmed by the Case Officer that there would be two parking spaces allocated.

On taking the vote, it was agreed that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions set out in the Case Officer's report.

**116 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS**

With no comments, questions or requirement for a vote, the determination of appeals was **NOTED**.

The meeting concluded at 19:39

Chairman .....