Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Hub, Mareham Road, Horncastle, Lincolnshire LN9 6PH on Thursday, 1st August, 2024 at 10.30am.

PRESENT

Councillor Stephen Eyre (Chairman)

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

Councillors Carleen Dickinson and Daniel Simpson attended the Meeting as a Substitute.

Councillor Terry Aldridge attended the Meeting as an Observer.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Andrew Booth	-	Development Management Lead Officer
Michelle Walker	-	Deputy Development Manager
Graeme Hyde	-	Senior Planning Officer
Stephanie Watson	-	Planning Officer
Martha Rees	-	Legal Representative
Lynda Eastwood	-	Democratic Services Officer

22. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alex Hall and Kate Marnoch.

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 Daniel Simpson had been appointed to the Committee in place of Councillor Ru Yarsley and Councillor Carleen Dickinson had been appointed to the Committee in place of Councillor Steve McMillan for this Meeting only.

23. 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 Daniel Simpson asked it be noted that in relation to Item 5 he was a member on the Invest East Lindsey Scrutiny Panel.

- Councillor Daniel McNally asked it be noted that in relation to Item 5 he was the County Council representative for Tetney, however he remained of an open mind.

- Councillors Dick Edginton, Stephen Eyre, Neil Jones, Daniel McNally and Daniel Simpson asked it be noted that they were Members of the Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board.

Following which, the Chairman read out a declaration on behalf of all Members of the Committee with regards to Item 5 which was an application made on behalf of the Council as applicant and landowner. He commented that it would not affect how the Committee determined the application and advised that all Members had been trained and were open minded to determining the application.

24. MINUTES:

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 11 July 2024 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

25. UPDATE FROM PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

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

26. N/178/02377/23:

Application Type: Outline Planning Permission

Proposal: Outline erection of up to 34no. dwellings.

Location: LAND AT, HUMBERSTON ROAD, TETNEY

Applicant: Mr A Fisher

Members received an application for Outline Planning Permission – Outline erection of up to 34no. dwellings at land at Humberston Road, Tetney.

The site owner and applicant of the site was East Lindsey District Council and therefore in the interest of transparency in the decision making process, determination by Committee process was required.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- The Principle of Development.
- Design and impact on character of the area.
- The Impact of Neighbouring Residential Properties.
- Access/Highway Matters.
- Drainage.
- Biodiversity.
- Contributions.

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

Graeme Hyde, Senior Planning Officer, detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, pages 13 to 14 of the report refer.

Mr Ricky Newton (Architect) spoke in support of the application.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speaker.

- A Member highlighted the neighbours' letters detailed at Paragraph 4.18 of the report which outlined concerns relating to 14 dwellings in the flood risk zone and contradicted Paragraph 7.16 of the report whereby it stated that there would be no dwellings in that area.

  Mr Newton advised that the site was split between Flood Zones 1 and 2 and included an attenuation pond. There were also some dwellings located in Zone 2 but consideration was given to the entire site and as an Exceptions Test was not required, Zone 2 was considered the better location.

- Further to a query whether there were 14 dwellings in the Flood Zone planned, Mr Newton responded that he could not confirm this.

- When asked whether he agreed with the S106 Agreements for the NHS and school provision, Paragraphs 7.29 and 7.31 of the report refer, Mr Newton confirmed that both he and the applicant agreed with the detail set out in the agreements.

- Following a query with regards to the maintenance of the pond area, Mr Newton advised Members that this would be offered to Anglian Water for adoption. Historically this was something they would accept and they would take on the liability for this area.

- A Member queried whether the new dwellings would include solar panels on the roofing. Mr Newton responded that current building regulations would have to be complied with, however there was no current requirement for this.

- Following a query on the ownership and access to the undeveloped area on the map, Mr Newton advised that he was unsure who owned it. However, the application had been designed to include a leg which would open up the area and as required by Highways, any adopted roads would need to go up to the boundaries to prevent ransom strips.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- Following a request for further clarification relating to the Flood Risk Zones, the Senior Planning Officer advised Members that the Flood Risk Zones were only in the bottom part of the site and that it was an allocated site with mitigation measures recommended by the Environment Agency to address floor levels. Members were further advised that the majority of the site was classed as Zone 1, with a small area of the site in Zone 2 and Zone 3. The Senior Planning Officer assured Members that satisfactory sequential testing had been carried out.

- A Member raised a concern with regards to there being no tree planting included at the bottom section of the site at Staves Court and requested that this be addressed.

The Development Management Lead Officer advised Members that advisory notes could be added on to the permission if granted to address the issues mentioned by Members when the reserved matters came forward.

- A Member commented that the Parish Council was not aware that the affordable housing allocation had not been included in the application and stressed the importance of the 10 houses being included. The Development Management Lead Officer referred Members to Condition 15, page 28 of the report which clarified this.

Following which, the application was Proposed and Seconded for approval in line with officer recommendation.

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

Vote: 9 In favour 0 Against 1 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

27. S/195/02091/23:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Erection of 5no. dwellings with the creation of internal roads, including the demolition of existing agricultural buildings.

Location: LAND OFF, BOSTON ROAD, WAINFLEET ST MARY

Applicant: C W Parker (Wainfleet) Limited

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission – Erection of 5no. dwellings with the creation of internal roads, including the demolition of existing agricultural buildings at land off Boston Road, Wainfleet St Mary.

The proposed development would constitute a departure from the development plan for the district and was recommended for approval. It was therefore required to be determined by the Planning Committee.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- The principle of development.
- Impact on the character of the area.
- Impact on residential amenity.
- Drainage and Flood Risk.
- Ecology.
- Contamination.
- Highways Safety.
- Biodiversity and Net Gain.
- The Planning Balance.

Members were referred to the additional information contained on pages 2 to 3 of the Supplementary Agenda

Stephanie Watson, Planning Officer, detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, pages 33 to 34 of the report refer.

There were no speakers on this application.

Following which, the application was opened for debate and Members were invited to put their comments and questions forward.

- A Member commented that the application was better designed than previous similar applications as a Class Q planning exemption was not required.

Following which, the application was Proposed for approval in line with officer recommendation.

- Further to a query whether the open front barn was to be converted, the Planning Officer advised Members that this would be demolished. The Development Management Lead Officer explained that he was content that the Class Q fallback position would allow for the conversion of 5 dwellings.

- A Member considered that the application should be refused on the grounds of flood risk, open countryside and could see very little betterment from the proposal.

- A Member queried how much of the current building would be retained for Class Q. The Development Management Lead Officer explained the planning balance to Members, referring them to Paragraphs 7.45 to 7.49, page 43 of the report refers.

- A Member commented that the proposed application was a disappointment, however considered that the building was in an open rural area and on a good site in a desirable location. He was of the opinion that the plot would be better suited to 3 well designed houses which would enjoy the area with a natural border of trees benefiting from less traffic movement, noise and lighting resulting in a lesser impact on the area.

- A Member raised further concerns around the foul water drainage and queried whether the drainage currently in place was able to cope with 5 dwellings. The Development Management Lead Officer referred Members to Paragraph 7.29 of the report which confirmed how this would be dealt with and assured Members that there was a condition in place to ensure that the foul water dispersal was adequate prior to the development taking place.

Following which, the application was Seconded for approval in line with officer recommendation.

Following which, the application was Proposed and Seconded for refusal against officer recommendation.

- A Member considered that the only betterment to the site was the character and design. The Development Management Lead Officer agreed with the above comment and added that there was also betterment from the biodiversity net gain element.

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for approval in line with officer recommendation, subject to conditions, was as follows:

Vote: 7 In favour 3 Against 0 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

28. APPEALS DECIDED:

The Appeals Decided were noted.

29. DELEGATED DECISIONS:

The Delegated Decisions were noted.

30. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

The date of the next meeting was noted as Thursday 5 September 2024.

The Meeting closed at 11.19am.