Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chambers at The Hub, Mareham Road, Horncastle, Lincolnshire LN9 6PH on Thursday, 7th August, 2025 at 10.30am.

PRESENT

Councillor Stephen Eyre (Chairman)

Councillors Dick Edginton, David Hall, Neil Jones, Terry Knowles, Steve McMillan, Kate Marnoch, Terry Taylor and Robert Watson.

Councillor Richard Cunnington attended the Meeting as a Substitute.

Councillors Terry Aldridge and Sam Kemp attended the Meeting as Observers.

Councillor Tom Ashton attended the Meeting as a Guest.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Abbie Marwood	-	Group Manager - Planning and Development
Andrew Booth	-	Development Management Lead Officer
Michelle Walker	-	Deputy Development Manager
James Felton	-	Legal Representative
Lynda Eastwood	-	Democratic Services Officer

22. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alex Hall and Daniel McNally.

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 Richard Cunnington had been appointed to the Committee in place of Councillor Ru Yarsley 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 Neil Jones asked it be noted that with regards to Item 6 he was Ward Member but would remain in the meeting with an open mind.

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

24. MINUTES:

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 3 July 2025 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

25. UPDATE FROM PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Councillor Tom Ashton, Chairman of Planning Policy Committee provided Members with an update. He advised that the status of the Local Plan remained uncertain as progress was dependent on the Government to come forward with its national policy updates and changes necessary to advance the plan review and associated local plan work.

Members were further informed that there was an ongoing issue with the housing targets resulting from the methodology used by the Government to calculate the targets, however this was being challenged by East Lindsey District Council together with a number of other Councils.

It was also highlighted that should the Local Government Reorganisation progress, a new level of plan may need to be created with three or four Local Plans being merged into one.

The Chairman of the Planning Policy Committee further informed Members that the second stage of the Grimsby to Walpole pylons project consultation had concluded and East Lindsey District Council had submitted a formal response.

26. S/122/00592/24:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Change of use of part of the existing building from agriculture to dog breeding (works commenced).

Location: Land rear of Meadow View Farm, Lodge Lane, Minting

Applicant: Mr W Tidd

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission – Change of use of part of the existing building from agriculture to dog breeding (works commenced) at land rear of Meadow View Farm, Lodge Lane, Minting.

The application was required to be determined at Planning Committee due to the significant level of public interest.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle of Development
- Impact of the Development on the Amenity of the Neighbours
- Visual Impact
- Highway Safety and Capacity
- Biodiversity Net Gain and Ecology

Members were referred to the additional information contained on pages 1 to 5 of the Supplementary Agenda, including late additional objections that had been received along with officer comments and a letter of support from the local Ward Member, Councillor William Gray.

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 11 to 12 of the report refer.

Mr Charles Holt (Agent) spoke in support of the application.

Mr Mike Zehetmayr spoke in objection to the application.

Councillor Eric Clark spoke on behalf of Minting and Gautby Parish Council.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- Following a query in relation to how the dogs would be protected from the summer heat and whether a condition could be included to enforce this, Mr Holt advised Members that ventilators to improve the air flow were included in the plans, as requested by Environmental Health. He further explained that the building would be insulated which would prevent some of the heat build-up and provide some protection for the dogs.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member queried how the dogs would cope with being left in the building from 6pm to 8am, as per Officer Recommendation number 6, page 24 of the report refers and whether this was unreasonable. The Development Management Lead Officer explained that the limitation of the housing condition was advised by the Environmental Health officer in relation to managing the noise issue.

- A Member commented on the mutual contradiction where the applicant was being asked to restrict the noise whilst also being asked to look at the welfare of the dogs, Paragraph 4.2, page 13 of the report refers. The Deputy Development Manager explained that the kennels included outdoor runs and there was also an outside exercise area to be used with the dogs under supervision.

  The Chairman explained that there were planning and licensing elements to the application and the Committee's role was to determine the planning application.

- A Member commented that the temporary accommodation already on site was not being used to help with the care and welfare of the dogs out of hours and that a separate dwelling would be needed to address the issue.

The Development Management Lead Officer explained that temporary accommodation was already in place and available for the owner to use potentially for supervising the dogs if he chose to do so. It was clarified that the provision of permanent accommodation on site was not included in the current application and would require a separate application should the applicant wish to pursue it. Additionally, it was noted that the appropriate management of the business falls under the Licensing Department, however if a licence were to be refused, this could significantly influence how the business was operated.

- A Member queried how the dogs would be looked after during their breeding cycle.

  The Chairman commented that the applicant would need time to build up the business to make it viable and to be able to provide a more permanent living arrangement.

  The Deputy Development Manager informed Members that there could be someone present on site at all times with shift work being an option, therefore it would not necessarily require someone living on site.

- A Member highlighted that the Licensing Department dealt with the welfare of the dogs and the Planning Department dealt with the planning elements of an application, therefore a decision could only be made from what was in front of them and from the information provided in the Agenda pack could not see any planning issues to warrant a refusal.

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

- A Member highlighted the information in the Supplementary Agenda and commented that the RSPCA was overrun with homeless dogs.

The Legal Representative offered some clarity around the information in the Supplementary Agenda, referencing a recent case law and advised Members that animal welfare could be a material consideration when considering planning applications.

- A Member raised concerns regarding the welfare of the animals and suggested that Members visited the site in order to gain insight into the site's operation.

Following which, the application was Proposed and Seconded for a deferral in order for a site visit to be carried out.

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for a deferral for a site approval was carried.
Vote: 6 In favour 3 Against 1 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred for a site visit.

N.B. The Committee broke for a comfort break at 11:12am and reconvened at 11:25am.

27. 02027/25/FUL:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Erection of a dwelling with the construction of vehicular access.

Location: Plot Adjacent To 4 Lindsey Way, Gipsey Bridge

Applicant: Mr K Armstrong

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission – Erection of a dwelling with the construction of vehicular access at the plot adjacent to 4 Lindsey Way, Gipsey Bridge.

The application was to be considered by Planning Committee due to the overall level of public interest and the request from Councillor Tom Ashton to fully consider the sustainability credentials of the proposal mindful of flood risk concerns; consistency in decision making mindful of other planning committee decisions and the planning history of Lindsey Way.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Principle of residential development
- Character and Amenity impacts
- Technical issues
- Planning History and other matters

Members were referred to the additional information contained on pages 6 to 8 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, page 29 of the report refers.

Mr Kevin Armstrong (Applicant) spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Liz Quiney spoke on behalf of Thornton Le Fen Parish Council.

Councillor Tom Ashton spoke as Ward Member.

Members were invited to put their questions to the speakers.

- In response to a Member's query from a Member regarding sustainability and whether future planning policy changes would allow applications similar to Gipsey Bridge, Councillor Tom Ashton explained that this would largely depend on the Environment Agency's efforts to protect the Lincolnshire coast, as well as the progression of hazard mapping.

Following which, the application was opened for debate.

- A Member commented that the application was a flood risk and supported the officer recommendation.

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

At this point in the Meeting, the Development Management Lead Officer provided Members with guidance on the specifics of the application and the history of the site to support their decision making.

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

- A Member reminded the Committee of the importance of maintaining consistency in their planning decisions, noting that the site had been refused planning permission on multiple occasions since 1966.

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

- A Member highlighted the reasons for supporting the approval of the application and referred to Paragraphs 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4, page 38 of the Agenda refers.

- A Member commented that the proposal constituted an infill development and emphasised that each application should be assessed on its' own merit.

Upon being put to the vote, the proposal for approval against officer recommendation including delegated authority to officers for appropriate conditions was carried.

Vote: 8 In favour 2 Against 0 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

28. 02166/25/RVC:

Application Type: Full Planning Permission

Proposal: Planning Permission - Section 73 application to vary condition no. 2 (approved plans) as previously imposed on planning permission reference N/003/00997/24 for the extension and alterations to existing coach house, which is within the curtilage of a listed building to provide a function room, provision of a canopy, workshop and alterations to the existing car park.

Location: The Manor House, West Street, Alford

Applicant: East Lindsey District Council

Members received an application for Full Planning Permission – Section 73 application to vary condition no. 2 (approved plans) as previously imposed on planning permission reference N/003/00997/24 for the extension and alterations to existing coach house, which is within the curtilage of a listed building to provide a function room, provision of a canopy, workshop and alterations to the existing car park at The Manor House, West Street, Alford.

It was an East Lindsey District Council application and was included on the agenda for reasons of transparency.

The main planning issues were considered to be:

- Impact on heritage assets
- Impact on the street scene
- Impact on neighbouring amenity

Members received an update from Andrew Booth, Development Management Lead Officer, on the heritage situation before detailing site and surroundings information at Paragraph 2, together with the description of the proposal at Paragraph 3, page 41 of the Agenda pack refers.

There were no speakers on this application.

Following which, the application was opened for debate. No comments or questions were received.

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 was carried.

Vote: 10 In favour 0 Against 0 Abstention

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

29. DELEGATED DECISIONS:

The Delegated Decisions were noted.

30. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

The date of the next meeting was noted as Thursday 4 September 2025.

The Meeting closed at 11.52am.