

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Hub, Mareham Road, Horncastle, Lincolnshire LN9 6PH on Thursday, 5th December, 2024 at 10.30am.

PRESENT

Councillor Stephen Eyre (Chairman)
Councillor Alex Hall (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors Dick Edginton, David Hall, Sam Kemp, Daniel McNally, Kate Marnoch, Paul Rickett, Terry Taylor and Ruchira Yarsley.

Councillor Paul Rickett attended the Meeting as a Substitute.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Andrew Booth	- Development Management Lead Officer
Michelle Walker	- Deputy Development Manager
Lindsey Stuart	- Principal Planning Officer
James Felton	- Legal Representative
Elaine Speed	- Senior Democratic Services Officer and Civic Officer
Lynda Eastwood	- Democratic Services Officer

63. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Richard Cunnington, Terry Knowles and Steve McMillan.

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 Paul Rickett had been appointed to the Committee in place of Councillor Neil Jones for this Meeting only.

64. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS (IF ANY):

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

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

65. MINUTES:

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 7 November 2024 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

66. UPDATE FROM PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Members were advised that following the cancellation of the Planning Policy Committee meeting on 28 November, a briefing was arranged in its place for all Members, to include an update on s106 Agreements and the Plan-making process.

67. S/169/00025/24:

Application Type:	Outline Planning Permission
Proposal:	Outline Planning Permission - Outline erection of 46no. dwellings (with means of access and site layout to be considered).
Location:	LAND ADJACENT TO WILLIAM LOVELL CHURCH OF ENGLAND ACADEMY/STICKNEY MEADOWS, STICKNEY
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Cash

Members received an application for Outline Planning Permission – Outline erection of 46no. dwellings (with means of access and site layout to be considered) at land adjacent to William Lovell Church of England Academy/Stickney Meadows, Stickney.

The application was called in by Councillor Tom Ashton, Ward Member due to the significant public interest the proposal had generated and concern about encroachment into the open countryside.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle of the Development in Terms of Sustainability.
- Impact of the Development on the Character of Area.
- Impact of the development on the amenity of the Neighbours.
- Highway Safety and Capacity.
- Flood Risk and Drainage.
- Impact of the Development on Local Services.
- Other Issues (Contamination, archaeology, BNG).

Members were referred to the additional information contained on pages 1 to 2 of the Supplementary Agenda.

Lindsey Stuart, Principal 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.

Ms Liz Hopkins spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor Tom Ashton spoke as Ward Member. N.B. By agreement of the Chairman, Councillor Ashton was permitted to speak remotely due to being away attending to other Council business.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- Following a query from a Member with regards to the original planning application, Councillor Ashton clarified that it had been for 100 houses, and it was refused. The subsequent application for 50 houses was then approved for planning permission as the reduction in the number of houses was deemed acceptable.
- A Member queried which amenities had been lost from the village. Councillor Ashton responded that the village had lost the public house.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A concern was raised with regards to the width of the road going through Stickney Meadows and queried why the roads on new-build estates were so narrow.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the road width was determined by the guidance from Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) which helped to slow down traffic in a residential area.

- Referring to Paragraph 7.7, page 22 of the report refers, relating to minor changes to the original layout of the roads recommended by LCC, a Member queried whether there was any further information on the internal arrangements. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that those changes referred were in relation to ensuring there was sufficient space for refuse lorries to turn, and the more technical details including defining the edge lane, tactile crossings and footways.
- A Member raised a concern with regards to the children's playground and whether the planned location next to an attenuation pond was an appropriate location for it. The Principal Planning Officer advised that the application was for outline planning permission, therefore did not include the full details, however clarified that the playground was intended for the use of smaller children and would be fenced off.
- A Member queried whether a condition could be put in place with regards to the boundary of the development in order to prevent it from spreading further and testing the limits visually.

The Principal Planning Officer advised the application was for outline planning permission but layout was being considered.

- A Member referred the Committee to Paragraph 7.8 of the report, page 23 refers. It was highlighted that there were two conflicting statements, and particular reference was made to the comment from Anglian Water stating that the development may be at risk of flooding. The Principal Planning Officer advised that if the

development was approved, Anglian Water would have to make changes to the drainage system and plan.

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

The Development Management Lead Officer gave advice to Members with regards to the reasons they had put forward for refusing the application.

- A Member further commented that the development was in the open countryside.

The application was then proposed for approval in line with officer recommendation, with conditions to be added relating to the times of traffic movement and a foul water strategy with Anglian Water.

- A further Member commented on the settlement's character and appearance and asked for that point to be added for refusal of the application.

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for refusal against officer recommendation was carried.

Vote: 6 In favour 2 Against 2 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused.

N.B. Councillor Paul Rickett left the Meeting 11:09am and returned at 11:10am.

68. S/177/01465/24:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Erection of 9no. dwellings with associated works, alterations to existing vehicular access and demolition of existing shop/store and erection of a detached garage to serve the existing dwelling (Rose Cottage).

Location: AURA SOMA, SOUTH ROAD, TETFORD,
HORNCastle, LN9 6QB

Applicant: Aura Soma Products Ltd

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission – Erection of 9no. dwellings with associated works, alterations to existing vehicular access and demolition of existing shop/store and erection of a detached garage to serve the existing dwelling (Rose Cottage) at Aura Soma, South Road, Tetford, Horncastle.

The application was presented to Committee for determination as a consequence of local representation and requested by Councillor Daniel Simpson who raised a number of concerns in respect of the scheme detail and principles for development in Tetford.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle of Development
- Visual Impact on AONB
- Layout and Design
- Impact Heritage Assets
- Residential Amenity
- Highway Safety and Capacity
- Contaminated Land
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Ecology
- Climate Change
- Obligations/Contributions

Members were referred to the additional information contained on pages 2 to 3 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 33 to 34 of the report refer.

Mr Andrew McDowall of Evans McDowall (Agent) spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Daniel Simpson spoke as Ward Member.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

No questions were received.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member commented that the approval of the application would be the only chance of obtaining new growth within the village.

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

- When queried whether solar panels were included in the application the Development Management Lead Officer confirmed that they were.
- A Member queried whether there were any other commercial sites in the village. The Development Management Lead Officer advised that the business would transfer to one of Aura Soma's other sites

in the district so employment would not be lost. He further informed Members that it was a brownfield site in the heart of the village so was considered an appropriate development.

- Following a query with regards to the density of housing, the Development Management Lead Officer informed Members that in terms of the Local Plan, an average of 19 houses per hectare was considered suitable and this application had a density of 13 or 14 houses which was significantly less.
- A Member queried the amount of car parking space. The Development Management Lead Officer confirmed that there was an appropriate level of parking included within the application.

Following which, the application was 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 carried.

Vote: 10 In favour 0 Against 0 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

69. S/045/01351/24:

Cllr Rickett left room at 11:31 and returned at 11:32

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Erection of a bespoke dwelling with improvements to existing vehicular access.

Location: LAND SOUTH OF BELVOIR LODGE, BLACKSMITH LANE, EAST KEAL

Applicant: Mrs E Willis

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission – Erection of A bespoke dwelling with improvements to existing vehicular access at land South of Belvoir Lodge, Blacksmith Lane, East Keal.

The proposal was referred to Planning committee due to the significant level of public interest.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle

- Impact on the character of the area
- Impact on neighbour amenity
- Highway Safety
- Ecology
- Archaeology
- Land Contamination
- Foul and surface water disposal

Members were referred to the additional information contained on pages 3 to 4 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 53 to 54 of the report refer.

Mr Daniel Sharp of Lincs Design Consultancy spoke in support of the application.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- A Member queried whether the boundary treatment for the landscaping would be dealt with at the beginning of the works. Mr Sharp confirmed that this would be conditioned and timescales put in place in order to allow the landscaping time to establish.
- A Member queried whether the driveway went straight on to the A16 or on to Blacksmiths Lane. Mr Sharp confirmed that the driveway went on to Blacksmiths Lane.
- When queried whether the pylon would remain, Mr Sharp advised that it would not be moved as the development would be situated further back in the field.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member queried whether a time schedule could be included for construction management. The Development Management Lead Officer advised Members that there wasn't one proposed, however it could be considered
- A further Member requested that the boundary treatment for landscaping be added as a condition.

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 carried.

Vote: 10 In favour 0 Against 0 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

70. APPEALS DECIDED:

The Appeals Decided were noted.

71. DELEGATED DECISIONS:

The Delegated Decisions were noted.

72. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

The date of the next meeting was noted as Thursday 16 January 2025.

The Meeting closed at 11.47am.