

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber, Tedder Hall, Manby Park, Louth on Thursday, 4th November, 2021 at 10.15 am.

PRESENT

Councillor Dick Edginton (Chairman)
Councillor Thomas Kemp (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors Richard Cunnington, Stephen Eyre, David Hall, Alex Hall, Neil Jones, Daniel McNally, Helen Matthews, Edward Mossop and Jim Swanson.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Angela Simmonds	- Legal Advisor
Andrew Booth	- Development Management Lead Officer
Mike Gildersleeves	- Assistant Director, Planning and Strategic Infrastructure
Michelle Walker	- Deputy Development Manager
Joanne Paterson	- Democratic Services Officer
Kathryn Walton	- Democratic Services and Police and Crime Panel Officer

41. REGISTER OF ATTENDANCE:

Those present were noted. It was noted that apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Terry Aldridge, Billy Brookes and Sid Dennis.

It was noted that in accordance with Regulation 13 of the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, notice had been given that Councillor Edward Mossop had been appointed to the Committee in place of Councillor Terry Aldridge.

42. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS (IF ANY):

At this point in the Meeting, Members were invited to disclose any relevant interests. The following interests were disclosed:

With regard to Item 5, Councillor Jim Swanson asked that it be noted that he was currently a patient at the surgery at Spilsby. He considered that he was pre-disposed to be open minded to the matter and therefore did not consider that he had to remove himself for the Item.

With regard to Item 5, Councillor Thomas Kemp asked that it be noted that he sat on Spilsby Town Council and would therefore be leaving the room for the Item.

With regard to Item 6, Councillor Edward Mossop asked that it be noted that he was the Ward Member for Covenham St. Bartholomew. However, he informed Members that he would be speaking as a member of the

Planning Committee, not the Ward Member and considered that he remained open minded regarding the matter.

43. MINUTES:

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 2nd September 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

44. UPDATE FROM PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

It was noted that Councillor Sid Dennis was absent and therefore no report regarding the Planning Policy Committee was presented to the Members.

(NOTE: Councillor Kemp left the meeting at 10:25)

45. S/165/02238/20:

Application Type: Outline Planning Permission

Proposal: Outline erection of up to 600no. dwellings and a medical centre with provision of associated open space, landscaping, estate roads and cycleways.

Location: Land at Halton Road and Ashby Road, Spilsby

Applicant: Gin Property (Spilsby) Ltd

Members received an application for outline erection of up to 600no. dwellings and a medical centre with provision of associated open space, landscaping, estate roads and cycleways.

This application sought outline planning permission for residential development of up to 600 dwellings, a Medical Centre, open space, structural landscaping, estate roads and cycleways on 39ha of land to the east of Spilsby between Ashby Road and Halton Road. The site was based on an allocation in the East Lindsey Local Plan.

The application had been called in to be heard at committee for the reasons outlined at Paragraph 1.1 (agenda page 35 refers).

Members were referred to the Supplementary Agenda which included comments from the NHS regarding the Medical Centre and Highways regarding a request for further conditions. The Development Management Lead Officer confirmed that the conditions requested by the Highways Department had been agreed with the applicant and were therefore to be considered implicit to the recommendation and included in any conditions agreed on approval.

The Development Management Lead Officer detailed the site and surroundings information to Members, which were contained with the

report presented, Paragraphs 2.1 to 2.7 refers (Agenda pages 35 to 36 refers) and displayed on the presentation slides.

The main Planning issues were considered to be:

- The principle and quality of development.
- Technical considerations
- S.106 requirements, viability and other considerations.

As the application was for Outline permission and the planning recommendation was an unusual one (agenda page 51, para 9.1 refers), the Development Management Lead Officer detailed the reasoning behind the request for authority to be delegated to the Assistant Director Planning and Strategic Infrastructure to further discuss the way forward for the scheme. It was noted that due to the size of the scheme (600 houses plus a medical centre) the matter was considered a long term project, and was expected to take many years and numerous applications regarding the implementation of the reserved matters. He concluded by drawing attention to the urgency regarding the delivery of the medical centre as one of the main reasons for the unusual methodology being applied to the matter.

There was one speaker for this application, the applicant's agent Mr Michael Braithwaite.

Once the speaker had concluded his presentation, Members were invited to ask questions.

One Member queried that although the matter was an Outline application and they could not go into details, Sports England had commented regarding the lack of sports facilities for young persons. The Member commented further on a lack of references to health and wellbeing for young people. Therefore, Mr Braithwaite was asked if bearing in mind the size of the development, would not some sports-based facilities be desirable?

Mr Braithwaite responded that 1.5 hectares were being put aside for informal use and felt that some of that land could possibly be used for sports, noting that encouraging less formal sport facilities allowed a wider provision, stating it could be a viability issue. He acknowledge that Sports England had requested the provision of more formal sports facilities, however he did not believe that could be delivered within the site, and he noted that the less formal approach was preferred by his client.

Another Member noted that according to the plans, space had been left for plenty of green spaces and he appreciated that, but considered that there needed to be a sense of place and community factored into the design of the site and queried as to the measures to be put in place in respect of the green issues.

Mr Braithwaite responded that one of the key strategy concerns would be the drainage strategy with six large attenuation ponds to assist in the alleviation of standing water or flood issues. He continued that within the master plan, there was an intention to protect key local habitats including the emphasis of public rights of way into the town.

He concluded his response by informing Members that with regards to renewables, the application was Outline only and therefore there was no strategy regarding renewables at that time. He considered that future plans would include any renewables that would be statutorily required at the time of the application.

One Member noted that a recent development by the same developer had not included sufficient room for parked vehicles leading to congestion and a concern that emergency vehicles would not be able to traverse the estate. It was requested that the developer bear parking in mind with regard to any new applications and either establish a communal parking area or provide sufficient parking spaces.

Mr Braithwaite responded that the developer was attempting to avoid the development of cul-de-sacs within the estate.

One Member commented that he considered that the development would have no bearing on the infrastructure around it as it could not influence better access to the town.

When queried regarding attaining a zero carbon rating for the development, Mr Braithwaite returned that when the Reserved Matters Applications were filed, they would comply with all energy efficiency standards in place at that time.

One Member queried as to why the 600 dwellings on the outskirts was not designed as a mixed development, making housing the fundamental cornerstone but with a mixture of housing and supporting commercial uses to address the rural nature of the community.

Mr Braithwaite returned by informing the Member that the Applicant had been guided by ELDC policy to support the town centre, including cycle and walking routes, the application was also driven by national policy and support by Spilsby Town Council to encourage investment in the town centre.

Concern was raised regarding transportation from the development into Spilsby and the Development Management Lead Officer informed Members that no specific transport scheme for integration with Spilsby was proposed.

Further concerns were raised regarding transportation from Spilsby to other urban conurbations but other than an expressed wish that the Applicant would make the site an exemplar around green issues, no consensus was reached.

One Member considered the application to be good value, noting that the town council approved of the application and that compared with other "bolt on" applications the layout was good.

He was however, concerned by paragraph 7.21 of the report regarding viability which discussed the educational contribution declining from £2M to zero – noting that he had not seen the viability report and admitted to some confusion as to the fusion of 30% affordable housing and education contribution being funded from the same money and queried whether an "either/or" decision would be necessary.

The Panel's Legal Advisor informed Members that the difficulty with building 600 dwellings was that it was necessarily a long term plan, with sections potentially sold to different developers at different times. Therefore it was difficult for the Agent to answer some of the questions put to him. She considered that if Members looked at the whole, there was a possibility that in five years it would be time to consider the viability issue, but that was an issue which would not become valid until much further down the timeline.

The Member responded that he was minded to support approval of the delegation and negotiation recommendation, but highlighted that consideration of affordable housing and education needed to be addressed.

The Development Management Lead Officer responded that all the points raised were important, but the medical centre was the priority identified in the Local Plan. He continued that the negotiators would look at other particulars in order to provide the best mix of benefits for the rest of the Members aspirations.

The Assistant Director Planning and Strategic Infrastructure reminded Members that it would be helpful if an indication on the required priorities which they would prefer to see could be given. He went on to reflect that as a broad principle, the application had already been accepted baring the committee's approval, however future applications would need to be in line with any regulations in place at that time.

One Member considered that any emphasis should include the green agenda, with a holistic provision to ensure individuality to the site. He was reminded that at the current stage of the planning process, they were not able to say what was required. He conceded the point, but emphasised the Committee should be supportive, but be mindful for the need to a holistic approach due to the size of the site.

One Member considered the proposal to be premature and considered it to be outside the definition of an Outline Planning Proposal. The Development Management Lead Officer confirmed to the Member that this point had been discussed and the Committee's role was to agree in principle to approve further consideration and negotiation.

Further discussion regarding the need to decide between education and affordable housing took place with the need to give direction regarding the priorities agreed below:

- Education
- Sports Provision
- Social Housing

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved with delegation to officers to continue negotiations and upon being put to the vote, the proposal was carried.

Vote: 7 in favour 2 Against 1 Abstentions

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be approved subject to further negotiations and the completion of a s106 obligation.

(NOTE: Councillor Kemp returned to the Chamber at 11.15am)

46. N/037/01064/20:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission – Extension and alterations to the existing dwelling (which is a listed building) to provide a ground floor enlarged dining room, erection of a detached barn and construction of a manege.

Location: Haiths Farm, Main Road, Covenham St. Bartholomew, Louth, LN11 0PF

Applicant: Mr D. Baker

Members received an application for planning permission for an extension and alterations to the existing dwelling (which is a listed building) to provide a ground floor enlarged dining room, erection of a detached barn and construction of a manege. Listed Building Consent for the alterations and extension to the dwelling had been granted under separate application.

The application had been called in to be heard at committee for the reasons outlined at Paragraph 1.1 (agenda page 55 refers).

The Development Management Lead Officer detailed the site and surroundings information to Members, which were contained with the report presented, Paragraph 2.1 refers (Agenda page 55 refers) and displayed on the presentation slides.

The main Planning issues were considered to be:

- Impact of the development on the Historic Character and Significance of the Listed Building.
- Impact on the character of the area and impact on nearby residents.
- Archaeology.
- Drainage.
- Tree Preservation Orders.

There were two speakers for this application, Ms. Laura Clark who spoke in opposition and Mr. Darren Baker the applicant.

Once the speakers had concluded their presentations, Members were invited to ask questions.

The Applicant confirmed that the barn and the manege would be for the sole use of his family.

The applicant was queried as to why that particular portion of the farm's land had been chosen and the Panel's Legal Officer reminded Members that questions to the applicant or the objector should only refer to the application as detailed. It was argued that as the applicant had referred to his land to the north and east, then Members had the right to include this in their questioning.

The Development Management Lead Officer requested Members concentrate on the land covered by the application.

One Member queried the objector as to whether a fence would be of assistance with regard to her loss of privacy and amenity – she responded that as the fence would need to be over three metres high and she did not believe that it would assist, either by ensuring her privacy or muffling the noise from the manege. It would also inhibit sunlight from reaching her property.

At this point no further questions were raised by Members for either the applicant or the objector.

A Member queried the conditions requesting confirmation that they covered night lighting, restricted the barn to horses only, no commercial activities and environmental health issues. The Development Management Lead Officer confirmed they did cover those issues, Conditions 12, 13 and 14 referred.

There was some confusion with regard to the distance of the barn and the manege to the neighbour's property and both the applicant, the objector and the plans had given different distances which led to Members voicing confusion, with one Member requesting a site visit. The Development Management Lead Officer attempted to clear the confusion up as did the Assistant Director Planning and Strategic Infrastructure.

One member proposed that the matter be deferred until the December meeting so that a site visit could be arranged and this proposal was seconded.

One Member noted that riding would not be taking place 24/7 nor would the objector be in her kitchen 24/7 and considered that her amenity would not be troubled by this and proposed the acceptance of the Officer's recommendation and this proposal was seconded.

One Member noted that whilst he was happy with the proposal, he considered that the landscaping conditions should be enhanced to include evergreen plantings. He also queried the condition at 4.5 which said "daylight condition not acceptable" and asked for clarity as to the meaning.

The Panel's Legal Advisor advised Members that it would be unreasonable to restrict private use.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred for one month to allow a site visit to take place and upon being put to the vote, the proposal was lost.

Vote: 3 in favour 6 Against 1 Abstentions

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved with conditions and upon being put to the vote, the proposal for approval with conditions was carried.

Vote: 6 in favour 4 Against 1 Abstentions

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be approved with the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the expiration of four years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To take account of the present restrictions on implementing permissions, in order to assist the recovery and in order to comply with the requirements of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in accordance with the following approved plans:

Dwg No. LDC2987-PL-01A	Received by the LPA on 02/09/2020.
Dwg No. LDC2987-PL-02E	Received by the LPA on 30/06/2021.
Dwg No. LDC2987-PL-03B	Received by the LPA on 02/09/2020.
Dwg No. LDC2987-PL-04	Received by the LPA on 02/09/2020.

Dwg No. J553 01 P7

Received by the LPA on 29/09/2021.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and the interests of proper planning.

3. No development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme should include the following:
 1. An assessment of significance and proposed mitigation strategy (i.e. preservation by record, preservation in situ or a mix of these elements).
 2. A methodology and timetable of site investigation and recording
 3. Provision for site analysis
 4. Provision for publication and dissemination of analysis and records
 5. Provision for archive deposition
 6. Nomination of a competent person/organisation to undertake the work

The scheme of archaeological investigation must only be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the preparation and implementation of an appropriate scheme of archaeological mitigation in accordance with paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The archaeological site work must be undertaken only in full accordance with the approved written scheme referred to in the above Condition. The applicant will notify the Local Planning Authority of the intention to commence at least fourteen days before the start of archaeological work in order to facilitate adequate monitoring arrangements. No variation shall take place without prior consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory arrangements are made for the recording of possible archaeological remains in accordance with paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. A report of the archaeologist's findings shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and the Historic Environment Record Officer at Lincolnshire County Council within 3 months of the works hereby given consent being commenced unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority; and the condition shall not be discharged until the archive of all archaeological work undertaken hitherto has been deposited with the County Museum Service, or another public depository willing to receive it.

Reason: In order to ensure that satisfactory arrangements are made for the investigation, retrieval and recording of any possible

archaeological remains on the site and in accordance with paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. The surface and foul water drainage schemes for the site shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details shown on Dwg No. J553 01 P7 received by the Local Planning Authority 29th September 2021, and shall be fully implemented before the development is brought into use.

Reason: To ensure the development is not at risk of flooding and does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP16 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.

7. Before any works are carried out above the damp proof course a schedule of external materials, including samples where requested, to be used in the construction of buildings and hard surfaced areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of preserving/enhancing the appearance and character of the Conservation Area in which the site is located. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.

8. The windows and doors utilised in the development hereby permitted shall be of the design and detailing shown on LDC2987-PL-04 received by the Local Planning Authority on 2nd September 2020.

Reason: In the interest of preserving/enhancing the significance of the listed building. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.

9. Notwithstanding the detail submitted the render utilised in the development hereby permitted shall be K Rend silicone scraped texture in the colour grey.

Reason: In the interests of the preservation of the significance of the listed building. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.

10. Prior to the development hereby permitted first being brought into use details of a screen planting scheme of trees, hedges and/or shrubs on the west boundary of the site including details of positions, heights on planting and species shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme so approved shall be carried out in its entirety prior to the development first being brought into use. All trees, hedges and/shrubs shall be maintained by the owner or owners of the land on which they are situated for a minimum of five years beginning with the date of completion of the scheme and during that period all losses shall be made good as and when necessary.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate landscaping is provided to integrate the site into the local area. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP10 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.

11. The method of disposal for manure and other waste materials shall be in accordance with the details submitted by the agent by email 29th September 2020 and DWG No. LDC2987-PL-02D received by the Local Planning Authority 29th September 2020 which shows the location of the trailer. When the trailer is being kept on site for the storage of manure, it should be covered at all times to prevent leakage. Additionally, there shall be no burning of manure or stable sweepings on the land.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of local residents. This condition is imposed in accordance with paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

12. No external lighting shall be installed on site in connection with the development hereby permitted unless details of such lighting, including design, location, the intensity of illumination and fields of illumination, have been first submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Any external lighting that is installed shall accord with the details so approved.

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the development and the visual amenity of the area in which it is set. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP10 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.

13. The barn hereby approved shall only be used for the keeping of horses and no other livestock.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development in the interests of safeguarding amenity. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP10 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.

14. The stables and manege hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the occupation of the dwelling known as Haiths Farm, Main Road, Covenham St Bartholomew and not used for commercial use whatsoever.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development in the interests of safeguarding amenity. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP10 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.

15. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted the large sycamore tree positioned nearest the southern boundary of the manege hereby approved and shown to be retained on the approved plans shall be fenced off to the limit of its Root Protection Area in accordance with BS 5837:2012. The fencing shall consist of a braced

scaffold framework of not less than 2m height, with vertical tubes spaced at a maximum interval of 3m and with weldmesh panels securely fixed with wire or scaffold clamps, as outlined in the above British Standard. No works (including removal or mechanical levelling of earth), storage of materials (including soil), vehicular movements or siting of temporary buildings shall be permitted within the protected area and the fencing shall remain in place for the duration of the construction.

Reason: To help ensure that the site integrates into the local area. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP10 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.

16. No construction works, nor deliveries in connection with them, shall be carried out on site other than between the hours of 7.30am to 6pm Monday to Friday and between 8am and 2pm on a Saturday and at no time on a Sunday, Bank or Public Holiday.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of local residents. This condition is imposed in accordance with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

17. The Local Planning Authority has worked with the applicants and their agent in a positive and proactive manner to seek solutions to issues arising during consideration of the application and now considers the proposal is acceptable and there is compliance with the relevant Development Plan Policies and also with the National Planning Policy Framework.

47. N/137/01559/21:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission – Erection of a detached house with single garage and construction of a vehicular access.

Location: Pinfold Cottage, Hagg Road, Raithby, Spilsby, PE23 4DT

Applicant: Mr. E. Titley

Members received an application for Planning Permission for the erection of a detached house with single garage and construction of a vehicular access. The plans showed a detached two storey dwelling positioned centrally within the plot. A new access was to be created to Hagg Road and a parking and turning area was shown to the front of the dwelling.

The application had been called in to be heard at committee for the reasons outlined at Paragraph 1.1 (agenda page 71 refers).

Members were referred to the Supplementary Agenda which included a statement from the Applicant's Agent, who was unable to appear at the meeting.

The Chairman gave Committee Members a few minutes to consider the additional supplementary information.

The Development Management Lead Officer detailed the site and surroundings information to Members, which were contained with the report presented, Paragraph 2.1 refers (Agenda page 71 refers) and displayed on the presentation slides.

The main Planning issues were considered to be:

- The principle of the development in this location.
- Impact on the character of the area including the Raithby conservation area.
- Impact on neighbour amenity.
- Other matters – trees, drainage and highway safety.

There was one speaker for this application, Mr Trevor Brighton who spoke in opposition to the application.

Once the speaker had concluded his presentation, Members were invited to ask questions of the Speaker.

One Member queried the speaker's definition of intrusive, as he did not consider the positioning of the new dwelling to be intrusive.

Mr Brighton agreed with some of the Member's comments but retorted that as the dwelling would be beside the current cottage and it would also be the largest building and therefore intrusive. He continued that he agreed there were places that the dwelling to be placed but the reason for the current placing was simply financial and he believe that the objections outweighed that one good reason.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved with conditions and upon being put to the vote, the proposal for approval was carried.

Vote: 9 in favour 0 Against 1 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That Planning Permission be approved with the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the expiration of four years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To take account of the present restrictions on implementing permissions, in order to assist the recovery and in order to comply with

the requirements of Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall only be undertaken in accordance with the following approved plans;

Plan No. 135-EDT-0504-A1-01 B Received by the LPA on 02/09/2021.

Plan No. 135-EDT-0504-A1-02 B Received by the LPA on 02/09/2021.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and the interests of proper planning.

3. A one metre square freestanding panel of brickwork showing the type of brick to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed on site and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any works above the damp proof course. All new brickwork shall match that of the approved panel in terms of the type of bricks used, the method of bonding, mortar colour and pointing style. The brickwork panel so constructed shall be retained on the site until all brickwork has been completed.

Reason: In the interests of the architectural and historic integrity of the site and the development. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan and paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Prior to installation on site, details of the window frames to be utilised in the development hereby permitted, including samples if so required, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall indicate, at a scale of not less than 1:20, the longitudinal and cross-sectional detailing, cill and lintol detailing, and means of opening. The window frames shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained.

Reason: In the interests of the architectural and historic integrity of the site and the development. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan and paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Prior to installation on site, details of the design of all external doors to be utilised in the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The doors shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained.

Reason: In the interests of the architectural and historic integrity of the site and the development. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan and paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. Prior to installation on site, details, including samples if so required, of the roof tile or slate to be utilised in the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The tile or slate shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be so maintained.

Reason: In the interests of the architectural and historic integrity of the site and the development. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan and paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. Before any works are carried out above the damp proof course, final details, and samples if so required, of the decorative eaves, barge boards and rainwater goods, including their finished colour, to be used in the construction of the approved development must be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development must be carried out in accordance with the agreed details before it is brought into use.

Reason: In the interests of the architectural and historic integrity of the site and the development. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan and paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. Prior to first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted, details of the boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include the number, species, spacing and height at planting of any new hedges, and details of any fencing and walls where appropriate. The approved details shall be completed prior to the occupation of the dwelling and shall thereafter be so retained and maintained.

Reason: In the interest of preserving/enhancing the appearance and character of the Conservation Area in which the site is located. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan and paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. The development shall be completed in strict accordance with the recommendations detailed in the Tree Report prepared by C Barker and dated 23/07/2021.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate landscaping is provided to integrate the site into the local area. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policies SP10 and SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.

10. Before any works are carried out above the damp proof course a surface water strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No building shall be occupied until the

works have been carried out in accordance with the surface water strategy so approved.

Reason: To ensure the development is not at risk of flooding and does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP16 of the East Lindsey Local Plan and paragraph 167 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. Before any works are carried out above the damp proof course a foul water strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No building shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy so approved.

Reason: To ensure that the site is adequately drained and to avoid pollution. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP16 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, (or any Order or Statutory Instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order), unless otherwise shown on the approved plans, none of the following developments or alterations shall be carried out:
- i) the erection of freestanding curtilage buildings or structures including car ports, garages, sheds, greenhouses, pergolas or raised decks;
 - ii) the erection of house extensions including dormer windows, conservatories, garages, car ports, porches or pergolas;
 - iii) alterations including the installation of chimneys or flues, replacement or additional windows or doors, or the installation of roof windows;
 - iv) the installation of satellite dishes;
 - v) the construction of new areas of hardstanding.

Reason: To ensure the Local Planning Authority retains control over the future development of the site in the interests of its architectural and visual amenity and the visual amenity of the local area. This condition is imposed in accordance with Policy SP11 of the East Lindsey Local Plan.

48. DELEGATED DECISIONS:

The Delegated Decisions were noted.

49. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

The date of the next programmed meeting was noted as Thursday 2nd December 2021.

The Meeting closed at 12.10 pm.

