

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Hub, Mareham Road, Horncastle, Lincolnshire LN9 6PH on Thursday, 6th June, 2024 at 10.30am.

PRESENT

Councillor Stephen Eyre (Chairman)

Councillors Richard Cunnington, Dick Edginton, David Hall, Neil Jones, Terry Knowles, Daniel McNally, Kate Marnoch, Terry Taylor and Ruchira Yarsley.

Councillor Terry Aldridge attended the Meeting as a Substitute.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Andrew Booth	- Development Management Lead Officer
Lindsey Stuart	- Senior Planning Officer
Martha Rees	- Legal Representative
Lynda Eastwood	- Democratic Services Officer
Laura Allen	- Democratic Services Officer

**3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Alex Hall.

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 Terry Aldridge had been appointed to the Committee in place of Councillor Steve McMillan for this Meeting only.

**4. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS (IF ANY):**

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

- Councillor Neil Jones asked it be noted, that in relation to application number N/191/02200/23 he knew the applicant, however he remained of an open mind.
- Councillor Stephen Eyre asked it be noted that in relation to application number N/191/02200/23 he was Ward Member and would be speaking on that item.
- Councillors Dick Edginton, Stephen Eyre, Neil Jones and Daniel McNally asked it be noted that they were Members of the Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board.

In the absence of Councillor Alex Hall, it was proposed and seconded that Councillor Daniel McNally would act as Vice-Chairman for this Meeting only.

**5. MINUTES:**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 9 May 2024 and the Minutes of the Special Meeting held at the rising of the Annual General Meeting held on 22 May 2024 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**6. UPDATE FROM PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE**

Members were advised that there was no update for this item.

It was agreed that the following item would be brought forward on the Agenda.

**7. N/191/02200/23:**

**Application Type:** Full Planning Permission

**Proposal:** Planning Permission – Erection of a two-storey dwelling, outbuildings and landscaping on site of an existing agricultural barn which is to be demolished.

**Location:** LAND OFF, CHURCH LANE, ULCEBY

**Applicant:** Mr P Odling

Members received an application for full planning permission – Erection of a two storey dwelling, outbuildings and landscaping on site of an existing agricultural barn which was to be demolished at land off Church Lane, Ulceby.

The application was referred to Committee following a call-in request by the Ward Member Councillor Stephen Eyre. It was considered that it would also constitute a departure from the Local Plan.

Members were referred to the additional information contained on page 1 of the Supplementary Agenda.

Andrew Booth, Development Management Lead Officer, detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, pages 35 to 36 of the report refer.

Mr Phil Odling (Applicant) spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Stephen Eyre spoke as Ward Member.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- A Member queried whether there would be solar panels on the roof of the proposed dwelling. Mr Odling responded that there would be.

*N.B. Councillor Stephen Eyre left the Meeting at 10.49am*

COUNCILLOR DANIEL MCNALLY, VICE-CHAIRMAN IN THE CHAIR

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member queried whether there was sufficient distance between the existing building and proposed dwelling. The Lead Management Development Officer advised that the impact on neighbouring amenity was assessed and the distance was considered acceptable.
- A Member supported the application as it was an infill and considered it a betterment to the existing site. It was also highlighted that there was full support from the village. These comments were further endorsed by other Members of the Committee.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for approval against officer recommendation.

The Development Management Lead Officer explained the rationale behind the recommendation for refusal and also referred Members to the officer's report, Paragraph 7.20 on page 42 of the Agenda refers. He explained that there was a lot to commend the design however the officer's opinion was that it had not quite met the specific requirements to recommend for approval. However, if Members differed in their view and were minded to support the application on the basis of exceptional quality of design that would be recognised.

Members further commented that the exceptional quality of design, the existing surroundings and betterment should all be included in the proposal.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for approval against officer recommendation, subject to conditions.

Upon being put to the vote for approval, the vote was carried.

Vote:            10 In favour            0 Against            0 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

*N.B. Councillor Stephen Eyre returned to the Meeting at 10.58am*

COUNCILLOR STEPHEN EYRE, CHAIRMAN IN THE CHAIR

**8. N/092/02375/23:**

**Application Type:**            Outline Planning Permission

<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline erection of up to 50no. dwellings and associated infrastructure (with means of access, landscaping and layout to be considered).
<b>Location:</b>	LAND SOUTH OF, CHESTNUT DRIVE, LOUTH
<b>Applicant:</b>	KCS Development Ltd

Members received an application for Outline Planning Permission – Erection of up to 50no. dwellings and associated infrastructure (with means of access, landscaping and layout to be considered) at land South of Chestnut Drive, Louth.

The application was the subject of local concern and a call-in request by Ward Member Councillor Edward Mossop. The request was on the grounds that *'the site is not allocated in the ELDC Local Plan for Louth/Keddington and as such is a windfall site. The site has been described as 'infill' by the applicants. However, looking at the allocated sites in the Settlement proposals, it sits between the two sites LO311 and LO326 (or5) creating a pleasant block of open space on the edge of the settlement adding to the more rural, edge of town feel to Park Row.*

*The windfall site is for 50 houses which is considerably large and would merit it being considered as an allocated site in the future given proper consultation through the process given to a revised Local Plan. Objections from neighbouring new-build properties describe the problems that have occurred since their completion such as waterlogged gardens and poor mains foul water drainage. Objection from Louth Town Council. There is no Keddington Parish meeting. Until boundary changes take place, the properties will benefit from Louth Town Council services without any contributions from the residents through their Council Tax. This renders the application premature'.*

Members noted that the application was deferred from Planning Committee on 4th April 2024, Minute No. 6 refers. At that meeting concern was raised over the ownership of the stretch of Park Row from where the applicant's ownership ended to the Eastfield Road junction.

Members were referred to the additional information contained on page 1 of the Supplementary Agenda.

Lindsey Stuart, Senior Planning Officer, detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, page 14 of the report refers.

Mr Nick Pleasant (Agent) spoke in support of the application.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- A Member queried whether the concern raised that Anglian Water was not able to deal with the sewage had been resolved. Mr Pleasant responded that Anglian Water considered that there was sufficient capacity at the treatment works and highlighted that it was the Environment Agency that had raised the initial concerns. Mr Pleasant advised Members that the Environment Agency no longer objected and it was working with Anglian Water to address any potential issues.
- A Member considered that the proposed development was a windfall site that was not allocated in the Local Plan, therefore had not been through the proper consultation process that would have been required as it would be for an allocated site in the current plan.
- A Member queried whether Chestnut Drive would be the nearest public highway for East Lindsey Waste Services to access for collections. The Senior Planning Officer advised that Acorn Avenue was close to being adopted, following which the waste vehicle would then be able to enter the estate. It was further confirmed that the Nipper Service Bus would be able to access the estate.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for refusal against officer recommendation.

- A Member was in support of approving the application as the proposal was an infill in the middle of an existing housing estate.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for approval in line with officer recommendation.

A Member highlighted that the main reasons for refusal was connectivity through Chestnut Drive, along with sewage and drainage issues.

The Development Management Lead Officer advised Members that the policy had been considered very carefully by officers with input from the Environment Agency and Anglian Water and confirmed that waste capacity would be satisfactorily managed by a condition and improvements would be put in place before the development commenced.

Upon summing up and considering the points made, the Legal Representative advised caution to Members looking to use waste capacity issues as a reason for refusal.

Upon being put to the vote for refusal, against officer recommendation, Members voted as follows:

Vote:            2 In favour            7 Against            0 Abstention

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for approval in line with officer recommendation, subject to conditions, was agreed.

Vote:           7 In favour           2 Against           0 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

**9. APPEALS DECIDED:**

The Appeals Decided were noted.

**10. DELEGATED DECISIONS:**

The Delegated Decisions were noted.

**11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

The date of the next meeting was noted as Thursday 11 July 2024.

The Meeting closed at 11.30am.