

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Hub, Mareham Road, Horncastle, Lincolnshire LN9 6PH on Thursday, 16th January, 2025 at 10.30am.

PRESENT

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

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

Councillor Terry Aldridge and Lisa Davies, Senior Planning Lawyer, attended the Meeting as Observers.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

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

73. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sam Kemp.

74. 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 and Daniel McNally asked it be noted that they were Members of the Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board.

75. MINUTES:

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 December 2024 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

76. UPDATE FROM PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Councillor Terry Aldridge advised Members that the next meeting had been postponed and would now take place on 27 February 2025 to consider updates to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Local Plan.

77. S/152/02014/23:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Erection of 83 dwellings with landscaping, associated works, the construction of surface water attenuation basin and vehicular access.

Location: LAND REAR OF, PAGE CLOSE, SIBSEY

Applicant: Towey Homes Limited

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission – Erection of 83 dwellings with landscaping, associated works, the construction of surface water attenuation basin and vehicular access at land rear of Page Close, Sibsey.

The application was considered appropriate for consideration by the Planning Committee given the range of issues for consideration including, specifically, a need to consider implications arising from viability considerations for the proposed development.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle of the Development in this Location
- Impact on the Character of the Area
- Impact on the Amenity of Neighbours
- Highway safety and Capacity
- Surface and Foul Water Disposal
- S.106 matters including Affordable Housing and Other Contributions
- Other matters - Impact on TPO's, Archaeology and Biodiversity Net Gain

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 11 to 12 of the report refer.

Mr Simon Atha (Agent) spoke in support of the application.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- A Member queried whether any 1 bedroom houses would be included in the scheme and Mr Atha confirmed that the proposal included 1 to 4 bedroom dwellings.
- A Member queried why there were no solar panels on the proposal.

In response, Mr Atha explained that with the new building regulations that came in to effect last June there were enhanced and increased efficiency standards that house builders needed to meet. He informed Members that the developer may provide some solar panels as part of the process of making the dwelling as efficient as possible and that it would be looked at later in the process.

- In relation to the NHS provision and S106 Agreement a Member queried whether negotiations had taken place with the NHS with regards to the health service provision in Stickney and the growing number of residents.

Mr Atha advised Members that there was a package of infrastructure that had been agreed with financial contributions to be split between the health and education authorities. Mr Atha added that he would expect the money to be used to enhance the facilities at the nearest health facility.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- Following on from a request for further information on the financial contributions towards the health service, the Principal Planning Officer explained that the NHS had requested that the mitigation was for impact on several surgeries in the development catchment area including Stickney, Paragraph 7.10 on page 20 of the report refers.
- Following a query with regards to the distance from the site to the Dorothy Close crossing, the Principal Planning Officer advised that the exact distance was not known, however it would take around 10 minutes to walk there.
- A Member referred the Committee to Paragraph 7.7, pages 18 to 19 of the report refer, and expressed huge concern over the distance from the site to the Dorothy Close crossing. The Member was of the opinion that Lincolnshire County Council should be responsible for improving the junction crossing and not the applicant.
- In relation to no affordable housing being included in the scheme and the education and NHS contributions being split on a pro-rata basis, Option 3 in Paragraph 7.14 of the report refer, a Member queried whether the Planning sector was seeing an increase in such proposals.

The Development Management Lead Officer advised Members that the issue of viability was not unique to the application site and that any challenges were appraised independently on their viability position. Members were informed that it was a policy aspiration to try to deliver affordable housing and that the policy allowed for negotiation and reduction in affordable housing when justified through viability assessment.

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

- Further to a query on where residents bins would need to be taken to in order to be collected, the Principal Planning Officer informed Members that there was a condition for refuse collection points and pointed the location out to them.

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 agreed.

Vote: 12 In favour 0 Against 0 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

78. S/177/01345/24:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Erection of 1no. pair of semi detached dwellings, construction of a vehicular access and internal access road.

Location: LAND AT MANOR FARM, EAST ROAD, TETFORD

Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. R. Whitley

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission – Erection of 1no. pair of semi detached dwellings, construction of a vehicular access and internal access road at land at Manor Farm, East Road, Tetford.

The proposal fell within the Council's scheme of delegation however when the previous outline application on site was determined by committee, Members required that subsequent Reserved Matters were brought to committee. Although this was not technically a Reserved Matters application, it was the first detailed application at the site and in line with Members request, so was presented to committee for determination.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle/AONB/open space/design
- Heritage assets
- Biodiversity
- Access

- Drainage
- Impact of the development on the amenity of the neighbours

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 33 to 34 of the report refer.

Councillor Daniel Simpson spoke as Ward Member.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers. None were received.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member raised a concern with regards to the drainage and surface water and referenced Paragraph 7.56, page 48 of the report refers and requested that a condition be put in place to address the issue.

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

- A Member queried whether the development would be delivered with a piecemeal approach and the Senior Planning Officer advised that he thought it would.

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 agreed.

Vote: 12 In favour 0 Against 0 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

79. APPEALS DECIDED:

The Appeals Decided were noted.

80. DELEGATED DECISIONS:

The Delegated Decisions were noted.

81. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

The date of the next meeting was noted as Thursday 13 February 2025.

The Meeting closed at 11.03am.

