

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Hub, Mareham Road, Horncastle, Lincolnshire LN9 6PH on Thursday, 11th July, 2024 at 10.30am.

PRESENT

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

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

Councillor Robert Watson attended the Meeting as a Substitute.
Councillor Terry Aldridge attended the Meeting as an Observer.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Phil Norman	- Assistant Director – Planning and Strategic Infrastructure
Andrew Booth	- Development Management Lead Officer
Michelle Walker	- Deputy Development Manager
Jane Baker	- Senior Planning Officer
James Felton	- Legal Representative
Lynda Eastwood	- Democratic Services Officer

12. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

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

13. 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 Terry Taylor asked it be noted that in relation to Item 5 he was Ward Member, however he remained of an open mind.
- Councillor Neil Jones asked it be noted that in relation to Item 7 he was Ward Member and would be speaking on that item.
- Councillors Dick Edginton, Stephen Eyre, Neil Jones, Sam Kemp and Daniel McNally asked it be noted that they were Members of the Lindsey Marsh Drainage Board.

14. MINUTES:

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 June 2024 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

15. UPDATE FROM PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

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

16. S/168/01836/23:

Application Type: Outline Planning Permission

Proposal: Outline erection of 7 no. self-build/custom dwellings with associated access, parking, amenity space, landscaping and infrastructure works.

Location: LAND OPPOSITE CRISMA COTTAGE THORN LEA AND WILLOWS, CUL DE SAC, STICKFORD

Applicant: Wilkinson Properties (Boston) Ltd

Members received an application for Outline Planning Permission – Outline erection of 7 no. self-build/custom dwellings with associated access, parking, amenity space, landscaping and infrastructure works at land opposite Crisma Cottage, Thorn Lea and Willows, Cul De Sac, Stickford.

The application was referred to Planning Committee by virtue of the nature of the proposal and the significant level of local objection to the application.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle of the development and whether the site was a suitable location for housing having regard to flood risk.
- Flood Risk.
- Impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
- Residential amenity.
- Highway Safety.
- Drainage.
- Ecology.
- Provision of Self Build Housing.
- Other considerations.
- Planning Balance.

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 9 to 10 of the report refer.

Mr Paul Wilkinson (Applicant) spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Pam Bryant, Stickford Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- A Member queried why the applicant considered that the provision for the Over 55 housing was needed. Mr Wilkinson responded that the Planning Consultant had advised that it would be advantageous for him to submit an application for that type of housing.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member commented that having considered the current rules and regulations in relation to the application they would be happy to support the officer recommendation for refusal.

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

- Further to clarification of the officer's view on the number of self-build plots within the district, the Development Management Lead Officer referred Members to the officer's report, Paragraph 7.45 onwards on pages 22 to 23 of the Agenda refer.
- A Member queried whether the officer's recommendation would have differed if a higher standard of development for the Over 55 housing and the affordable housing had been demonstrated. The Development Management Lead Officer explained that an existing policy acknowledged the need for accommodation for the elderly in the district, however there was no evidence to show a specific need set out in the application. Members were also advised that with larger developments, affordable housing would be expected to be allocated on the site but he wasn't aware of any discussions having taken place around this with regards to the application.

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

Vote: 13 In favour 0 Against 0 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused.

17. S/094/00132/24:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Erection of a detached dwelling with detached car port, erection of 3no. detached holiday lodges, alterations to existing workshop building, excavation of land to form 2no. ponds and provision of associated access and car parking.

Location: DEANS FARM, KIRKBY LANE, KIRKBY ON BAIN,
LN10 6YZ

Applicant: Hockley Homes

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission - Erection of a detached dwelling with detached car port, erection of 3no. detached holiday lodges, alterations to existing workshop building, excavation of land to form 2no. ponds and provision of associated access and car parking at Deans Farm, Kirkby Lane, Kirkby on Bain, LN10 6YZ.

The proposed development contained a number of different elements including a dwelling to be considered under paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (on the basis of an exceptional quality of design which would be sited in an isolated location and so be contrary to the housing policies of the Local Plan and therefore a departure from the development plan for the district.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle of development as a whole in this location having regard to local and national policy.
- Impact on character of area.
- Impact on neighbours.
- Highway safety.
- Biodiversity.
- Flood risk and drainage.
- Impact on trees.
- Other matters.

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

Jane Baker, Senior Planning Officer, detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, pages 31 to 33 of the report refer.

Ms Naomi Wright (Architect) spoke in support of the application.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speaker.

- A Member queried how customers with limited mobility would access the properties as the parking was a distance away. Ms Wright advised that there were two parking spaces closer to the accessible properties and also a level track with a ramp to all of the properties to assist with accessibility.
- In response to a query on raising standards of design and whether the new proposed dwelling was considered as unique, Ms Wright commented that Paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) could be disputed and explained that their aim

in raising standards of design was to make an impact with sustainability.

Ms Wright also responded to queries raised with regards to the round earth wall, advising that it was south facing to enable the sun to hit the wall and act as a thermal store, limiting the amount of energy spent on heating.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- Following a query with regards to whether a design review had taken place, Members were referred to the officer's report, Paragraph 7.11 and 7.12 on pages 38 to 39 of the Agenda refer.

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

- A Member commented that it was a delight to see natural material in the design instead of glass and concrete and would support the proposal.
- A Member requested some clarification around raising standards of design and whether this was a national standard as he considered that the proposed design was not unique. Following which it was queried whether a Design Review should be undertaken.

The Development Management Lead Officer advised Members that there was a policy in the Local Plan that lent itself to secure good design outcomes from development proposals at a national level and looked at raising the standards of design. There was also national design guidance which outlined the principles for good design and encouraged the use of a Design Review Panel, however this was not an essential requirement.

- A Member highlighted that the proposal was a betterment compared to what currently existed on the site and would support the proposal.

Following which, the application was Proposed and Seconded for deferral to allow a Design Review Panel to take place and following a positive outcome to then provide the officers with delegated powers to approve the application.

Upon being put to the vote for deferral, Members voted as follows:

Vote: 3 In favour 9 Against 1 Abstention

Upon being put to the vote for approval, Members voted as follows:

Vote: 10 In favour 2 Against 1 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

18. S/029/01208/23:

Application Type:	Full Planning Permission
Proposal:	Planning Permission - Erection of a bungalow.
Location:	THE PADDOCK, MAIN ROAD, NEW BOLINGBROKE, BOSTON, PE22 7LN
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Firth

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission - Erection of a bungalow at The Paddock, Main Road, New Bolingbroke, Boston, PE22 7LN.

The application was called into Planning Committee by the Local Ward Member Councillor Neil Jones if recommended for refusal, for the following reasons:

- The infill Bungalow was required for the applicant's elderly mother so she may move closer to her son.
- This was infill in a village which required development to survive.
- There were no objections from neighbours and it was supported by the Parish Council.
- It was a medium sized village which had just appointed a Mayor.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle of the development and whether the site was a suitable location for housing having regard to flood risk.
- Impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
- Residential amenity.
- Highway safety.

Michelle Walker, Deputy Development Manager, detailed site and surroundings information to Members at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, pages 57 to 58 of the report refer.

Councillor Neil Jones spoke as Ward Member.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

A Member queried why the application submitted was for a 3-bedroom house and not an annex. Councillor Neil Jones responded that the mother

of the applicant would like her own independence and would be cared for by her family next door.

N.B. Councillor Neil Jones left the Meeting at 11.30am

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member commented that there was a flood risk element and queried whether there were other elements in the application that the officer was objecting to. Clarification was further sought whether there was a policy that related to accommodation being built in order to care for a relative.

The Deputy Development Manager explained that there was nothing in the report to confirm that the relative would be living in the property when built and confirmed that it was classed as an open market dwelling.

- Following a further query with regards to the type of policy the build would fall under, the Development Management Lead Officer advised Members that he was not aware of a policy specific to that situation.
- A Member highlighted that the only reason set out for refusal was that the application was in a Flood Risk Zone 3. Therefore, with a 1% chance of flooding in any year it was considered that it made no sense to refuse the application.

The Development Management Lead Officer confirmed that the flood risk was the only reason for refusal and went on to explain to Members the process around the sequential and exceptions tests which needed to be undertaken as per the Local Plan and national policy. He highlighted that the application had not passed the first two parts of the sequential and exceptions tests.

- A Member queried whether New Bolingbroke had exceeded its infill rate, to which the Development Management Lead Officer responded that it had not.
- Clarification was requested whether the recommendation would have been different if the application was submitted for an annex, rather than a separate dwelling. The Development Management Lead Officer responded that an annex would have been given different consideration.
- A Member queried with regards to the flood risk, why the applicant would want to go ahead with the application if this would put his mother in a dangerous situation.

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

- Members commented that they did not consider that the proposed dwelling was modest and understood that the applicants had opted for a 3-bedroom property as they were looking to the future and the possibility of selling it.
- A Member added that as the proposed dwelling was a separate building they would be supporting the officer's recommendation for refusal.

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

The application was seconded for approval against officer recommendation with the reasons given that flooding had not been a major issue in the past and the applicants had mitigated against any flooding by raising the floor level.

At the request of one of the Members, the Development Management Lead Officer explained the outcome of a previous application that related to SP9 (Single Plot Exceptions) in the Local Plan, which would support single plot development for affordable housing provided it met a set criteria, and why it would not apply to the proposed application.

Phil Norman, Assistant Director Planning and Strategic Infrastructure, addressed Members and advised them that Planning officers took a policy led approach to decision making and had to make the decision with the evidence and information put before them.

Upon being put to the vote for approval, against officer recommendation

Vote: 4 In favour 8 Against 0 Abstention

Upon being put to the vote for refusal in line with officer recommendation

Vote: 9 In favour 2 Against 1 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused.

19. APPEALS DECIDED:

The Appeals Decided were noted.

20. DELEGATED DECISIONS:

The Delegated Decisions were noted.

21. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

The date of the next meeting was noted as Thursday 1 August 2024.

The Meeting closed at 12.00pm.