

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Hub, Mareham Road, Horncastle, Lincolnshire LN9 6PH on Thursday, 4th April, 2024 at 10.30 am.

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, Ruchira Yarsley and Robert Watson.

Councillors Terry Aldridge and Tom Ashton 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
Lindsey Stuart	- Senior Planning Officer
David Dodds	- Environmental Health Service Manager- East Lindsey
Martha Rees	- Legal Representative
Lynda Eastwood	- Democratic Services Officer
Laura Allen	- Democratic Services Officer

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sid Dennis.

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.

On behalf of the Committee, the Chairman sent best wishes to Councillor Sid Dennis.

The Chairman welcomed Phil Norman to the Meeting following his recent appointment to Assistant Director, Planning and Strategic Infrastructure.

**2. 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 David Hall asked it be noted that he knew one of the speaker's in relation to Item 6, however he would remain in the Meeting with an open mind.

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

**3. MINUTES:**

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

**4. UPDATE FROM PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE**

Councillor Tom Ashton, Chairman of Planning Policy Committee, advised Members that at the previous Meeting held on 14 March 2024, there was a discussion on large scale structures and pylons and informed Members that their infrastructure policies would be reviewed.

**5. S/086/01714/23:**

**Application Type:** Full Planning Permission

**Proposal:** Planning Permission - Creation of a 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) with perimeter fencing, acoustic fencing, hardstanding areas, storage container, floodlights, access footpath and associated bund.

**Location:** QUEEN ELIZABETHS GRAMMAR SCHOOL, WEST STREET, HORNCastle, LN9 5AD

**Applicant:** Horncastle Education Trust

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission – Creation of a 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) with perimeter fencing, acoustic fencing, hardstanding areas, storage container, floodlights, access footpath and associated bund at Queen Elizabeth’s Grammar School, West Street, Horncastle, LN9 5AD.

The application was subject to considerable local interest and was also subject to a Committee call-in request by Councillor Sandra Campbell-Wardman and Councillor Richard Avison as local Ward Members.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Impact on residential amenity
- Impact on the highway network
- Flood risk and surface water drainage

- Other matters (Archaeology, Ecology, & Contamination)

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 17 to 18 of the report refer.

Mrs Sandra James (Applicant) and Mr Tom Betts (Developer) spoke in support of the application.

Mr Stephen Pickwell spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor Richard Avison spoke as Ward Member.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- Several queries were raised with regards to the fencing between the proposed pitch and the neighbouring properties and whether security and noise would be an issue. Councillor Avison highlighted that security at night time was a major concern as there would be no security or school staff on site at this time.
- A query as to whether the location of the new pitch could be changed was also raised. Mrs James advised that following a number of site visits and consideration being given to the school day, the school's facilities and the safety of pupils, the proposed location was the best option.
- Members were advised that the pitch would be open until 6pm on weekends and potentially 9pm on weekdays to accommodate use by the community.
- Councillor Avison considered that a site visit would be beneficial as the photos did not provide a good representation of the proposal.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member queried what mitigation measures had been put in place for the new housing development that was yet to be built with regards to access. The Development Management Lead Officer advised Members that he was content with the proposed access and explained that the bund would wrap around the three sides and there would also be boundary treatments.
- A Member proposed a site visit in order to get more clarity on the proximity of the proposed site to the residential properties, in

particular relating to the size of the proposed area and the opening hours which included weekends and evenings.

Following which, it was seconded that a site visit be carried out to assist Members with their decision making.

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

Vote:            12 In favour            0 Against            0 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That a site visit be arranged.

The Chairman advised Members that only those who attended the site visit would be able to debate and vote on the item at the next Meeting

*N.B. Councillor Daniel McNally left the Meeting at 11:20am and returned at 11:22am.*

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

**Application Type:** Outline Planning Permission

**Proposal:** Outline Planning Permission - erection of up to 50no. dwellings and associated infrastructure (with means of access, landscaping and layout to be considered).

**Location:** LAND SOUTH OF, CHESTNUT DRIVE, LOUTH

**Applicant:** 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'.*

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.
- Ecology.
- Impact of the Development on Local Health and Education Services.
- Contamination.

Members were referred to the additional information contained on pages 1 to 2 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, pages 39 to 40 of the report refer.

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

Councillor Paul Starsmore, Louth Town Council, spoke in objection to the application.

Councillors Ros Jackson and Edward Mossop spoke as Ward Members.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- A Member queried whether Park Row was an adopted road. Councillor Starsmore advised that he did not believe it was and commented that with the increase of footfall there was concern with regards to who was going to maintain the road.
- Following a query with regards to the footpath recommended by LCC Highways, Members were referred to pages 49 to 50 of the Agenda. The Senior Planning Officer advised Members that it was not possible to view this area on Google Maps as it was too far away from the development and the ground was in an unreasonable condition.
- A Member queried whether a reduction in the number of houses on the development would help the potential pressures to services in the area. Councillor Mossop informed Members that he believed it

would help as it was the last area of open space in that part of the town to be developed.

- It was queried whether Anglian Water was aware of the costs involved to install the infrastructure that was required at the treatment works due to the waste not going to the Louth Water Recycling Centre. Mr Pleasant informed Members that Anglian Water would ensure that the waste water works were upgraded.
- A Member queried whether the viability of the project would be affected by reducing the housing density. Mr Pleasant commented that he did not consider that it was a particularly dense scheme as there was quite a lot of green space.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- Members discussed their concerns with Anglian Water and also that the Environment Agency had originally objected to the proposal regarding the capacity at Louth Water Recycling Centre. In response, the Legal Representative advised Members that they had to assume that any other statutory regimes would work as directed in the NPPF and this was outside of the Council's planning regime.
- Further discussions were held in relation to Park Row and whether the road was adopted as there was some confusion relating to pedestrian access and whether residents would be responsible to pay for any repairs.
- Members raised concerns with regards to the number of houses on the application and issues with the single access point.
- A Member commented that the Committee should not be discussing small irrelevant issues. It was highlighted that Anglian Water had a statutory duty with regards to infrastructure, Lincolnshire Highways had cited no objections to the application, there would be S106 payments for the provision of NHS services and education and there would be provision for 30% of affordable homes.

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

As there was uncertainty relating to Park Row and whether the road was adopted or not, officers highlighted that Members could consider a deferral to allow discussions with Lincolnshire County Council and the applicant.

Following which, the application was proposed and seconded for deferral to allow officers to confirm the status of Park Row and to then report back to Members for full consideration of the application to resume.

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

Vote: 12 In favour 0 Against 0 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the item be deferred in order to obtain further information on the road that ran along Park Row.

*N.B. The Committee broke for a comfort break at 12:10pm and reconvened at 12:15pm.*

**7. N/128/00956/22:**

**Application Type:** Full Planning Permission

**Proposal:** Planning Permission - Erection of a house, and outbuildings that comprises of a garage/car port, store and greenhouse, and construction of a wildlife pond.

**Location:** LAND NORTH OF LOUTH ROAD, NORTH COCKERINGTON, LOUTH, LN11 7DY

**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Parker

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission – Erection of a house, and outbuildings that comprised of a garage/car port, store and greenhouse, and construction of a wildlife pond at land North of Louth Road, North Cockerington, Louth, LN11 7DY.

The proposal was subject to a call-in request by Councillor Terry Knowles as the local Ward Member and, if approved, would not fully comply with requirements of the East Lindsey Local Plan. For clarity, however, because elements of the proposal would accord with adopted policy, it was not regarded as a departure from the development plan.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle of development
- Visual amenity and the impact on the character and appearance of the rural area
- Residential amenity
- Highway safety
- Ecology
- Other material considerations and the planning balance principle

Members were referred to the additional information contained on page 2 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 61 to 63 of the report refer.

Mr and Mrs Parker (Applicants) spoke in support of the application.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- A Member queried whether the building was going to be constructed of concrete. Mr Parker responded that the proposal was for a timber clad solution with the garage block in a traditional farmhouse style.

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

- Following a Member's query on Policy SP8, Paragraph 7.4 on page 67 of the Agenda refers, Mr Parker informed Members that they were trying to create a new lifestyle in the countryside that enabled them to be more self-sufficient and that the application was not an agriculturally linked scheme.
- A Member queried whether the 10% bio-diversity net gain calculation had been included in the net gain application as it was considered that this looked higher. Mr Parker responded that it had been included.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

A discussion ensued on how the application was recommended for approval by officers when it was a dwelling in the open countryside and did not meet the usual exception tests. The Development Management Lead Officer referred Members to paragraph 7.32 on page 72 of the agenda which outlined the planning balance considerations for the proposal.

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

Vote:            11 In favour            0 Against            1 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

**8. DELEGATED DECISIONS:**

The Delegated Decisions were noted.



**9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

The date of the next meeting was noted as Thursday 9 May 2024.

The Meeting closed at 12.41 pm.

This page is left intentionally blank