

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR I G FLEETWOOD (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors P Bedford, D Brailsford, M Brookes, N D Cooper, D R Dickinson, R Hills, D C Hoyes MBE, H R Johnson, K Milner, J M Swanson, T M Trollope-Bellew and S F Williams

An apology for absence was received from Councillor M Tinker

Officers in attendance: Communities Directorate - Graeme Butler, Alan Freeman, Martin Hollingsworth, Neil McBride, Brian Thompson and Matthew Wilson; Chief Executive's Office - Caroline van der Feist and Steve Blagg

80 . DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLORS' INTERESTS

Councillor R Hills declared a personal interest in all matters on the agenda affecting the City of Lincoln Council as a member on the Planning Committee of that Council and as a member of the Upper Witham Drainage Board.

Councillor T M Trollope-Bellew declared a personal interest in minutes 85 and 87(3) as he had attended the meetings of the Parish Councils when both had been discussed.

Councillor J M Swanson declared a personal interest in minutes 87(1), 88(1), 88(3) and 88(4) as a member on the Planning Committee of East Lindsey District Council.

Councillor P Bedford declared a personal interest in all matters on the agenda affecting the Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership as a member of the Partnership.

Councillor D C Hoyes declared a personal interest in minute 88(4) as he advised the Executive Councillor responsible for County Farms.

Councillor K Milner declared a personal interest in all matters on the agenda affecting East Lindsey District Council as a member of that Council and as the Executive Support Councillor for Highways and Transport.

Councillor D R Dickinson declared a personal in all matters on the agenda affecting North Kesteven District Council as a member of that Council's Planning Committee.

Councillor H R Johnson declared a personal interest in minutes 87(4) and 87(5) as the Portfolio Holder for Waste at South Holland District Council and the District Council used the site owned by the applicant (Mid UK Recycling Ltd) at Caythorpe.

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
14 FEBRUARY 2011**

Councillor N D Cooper declared a personal interest in all matters on the agenda affecting East Lindsey District Council as an Executive Councillor with responsibility for planning on that Council.

81. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 17 January 2011 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

82. PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES – LIME TREE AVENUE (PART),
GAINSBOROUGH

The Executive Director for Communities presented a report on objections received following local consultations and public advertisement of the proposed Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on part of Lime Tree Avenue at its junction with Spital Hill, Gainsborough

The report detailed the proposals and comments from the Executive Director on the objections received.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the objections be overruled and that the Order as advertised be implemented.

83. SPILSBY, BOSTON ROAD – PROPOSED “NO WAITING AT ANY TIME”
RESTRICTION

(NOTE:- Councillor J M Swanson declared a personal interest as the District Ward and County Division Member for Spilsby).

The Executive Director for Communities presented a report on objections received following public advertisement for a “No Waiting At Any Time” restriction along Boston Road, Spilsby.

The report detailed the proposals and comments from the Executive Director on the objections received.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the objections be overruled and the order as advertised be implemented.

84. WELTON, LINCOLN ROAD – PROPOSED BUS STOP IMPROVEMENTS

The Executive Director for Communities presented a report on an objection received following consultations carried out into the introduction of a Bus Stop Clearway at a bus stop proposed on Lincoln Road in Welton.

The report detailed the proposals and comments from the Executive Director on the objection received.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the objection be overruled and the proposals be implemented.

85. UFFINGTON, GREATFORD ROAD – PROPOSED ONE WAY SYSTEM

The Executive Director for Communities presented a report on objections received and responses in support, following statutory consultation of the proposed one way system on Greatford Road, Uffington.

The report detailed the proposals and comments from the Executive Director on the objections received.

Councillor M T Trollope-Bellew, in moving the recommendation in the report, requested that Greatford Road should be narrowed by white lines and repeater signs provided. Councillor D Brailsford, in seconding the motion, considered that repeater signs were not necessary.

The Committee agreed to Councillor M T Trollope-Bellew's motion but not to the repeater signs.

The Director stated there would be a need to discuss the Committee's proposals with the Parish Council and the local Member before they were implemented.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the objections be overruled and a one way system northbound along Greatford Road between the A16 and The Charters be implemented but before any action is taken to narrow Greatford Road and signage put in place officers discuss the proposals with the Parish Council and local Member.

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
14 FEBRUARY 2011**

86. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS – PROGRESS REVIEW AND PETITIONS
RECEIVED

The Executive Director for Communities presented a report on the current position of all current Traffic Regulation Orders. He stated that no petitions had been received.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

87. PLANNING APPLICATIONS RELATING TO COUNTY MATTER
DEVELOPMENTS

The Committee received nine reports from the Executive Director for Communities on planning applications relating to County Matter developments.

The results of consultations and publicity were detailed in the reports.

- (1) To change the use of an external storage yard and building to a materials recovery facility comprising of the recycling, processing and storage of metal and wood and an end of life vehicle dismantling and de-pollution facility at land and buildings at Binbrook Technical Park, Brookenby - Winchester Marine (Brookenby) Ltd - W128/126659/10

Since the publication of the report responses to consultation had been received as follows:

Edward Leigh, MP – on behalf of local residents, objects to the application due to extra traffic comprising large vehicles travelling through Binbrook and Tealby. This is an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, this is a business park not an industrial site. There will also be a noise nuisance.

Binbrook Parish Council – submitted a petition with 264 signatures objecting to the application for the following reasons:-

- noise from crushing and compacting of cars being undertaken outside and internally;
- airbag gases;
- interior plastics and foam in the car seats;
- old tyres, oil, lubricants, fuel and tanks;
- burning of some of the above;
- concern about movement of large HGVs through the village and conservation area;

- safety issue in respect of parents of the school and residents, unsuitable road network and constant noise from vehicles disturbing the environment in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) location;
- note have experienced 5½ years of having vehicles associated with the removal of the runway do not want further disturbance arising from this proposal.

West Lindsey District Council (Planning) – the West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) do not support this proposal. We share the concerns of the Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Service and others about the application. The detail of the application raises more questions than answers. It is our view that the measures that have been put forward to ameliorate the activities on this site will in themselves have a damaging effect on the appearance and setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). In particular:

- The proposed 5 metre earth bund surrounding the timber storage and shredding operation to the east of the site will have a significant adverse impact on the open views both from within the site and from views into the site.
- There are a number of other “sound alleviating boundary treatments” of varying heights of 3, 4 and 5 metres. These solid boundary measures subdivide previously open apron areas in front of the hangars, and also screen the open areas between two of the hangars. These artificial subdivisions are based on land ownership boundaries and will appear in a landscape perspective as an arbitrary and discordant element within the setting of the aprons to the 4 main historic hangars.
- The concrete apron in front of the 4 main hangars also has a “beefed up” woodland planting screen proposed. This is proposed to be planted within the concrete area itself. What measures are proposed to accommodate this? How successful will a planting scheme be when it is expected to “take” through a deeply disturbed concrete apron and subbase? If the base is to be broken up how will it be accomplished, what noise and dust issues will it create, and where will the hundreds of tons of soil go?

The airfield is within a nationally protected landscape, and the airfield is very much part of that intrinsic historic character. Subdividing the open apron area with a mixture of solid and planted interventions will totally change the long distance public views of this, the most important and representative part of the historic airfield.

The nature and intensity of the proposed use also has the potential to harm residential amenity. WLDC notes that the figure of 80 Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) movements a week may have been put forward by the applicants to quantify HGV traffic. If it has, this would breach the threshold of permissible vehicle movements set at 40 by the Appeal Decision on this site (Ref: APP/N2535/C/08/2085832 Condition 6). This condition

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
14 FEBRUARY 2011**

enabled the Inspector to reach his conclusion that the appeal proposals would not unacceptably harm the tranquillity of the AONB as “external traffic to and from the site would be controlled by condition” (Paragraph 54, page 10). It follows therefore that a doubling of this level of traffic could not fail to have a harmful impact on the tranquillity of the AONB.

Local Resident – detailed objection letter raising the following points (summarised):-

- Will create significant visual, noise and air pollution as well as increased traffic movements having a detrimental effect to the character of the area especially with regard to residential amenity and the Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- consider that the excessive level of industrial traffic created by this proposal is not something that can be sustained by the local road network and will be at odds with the rural character of the area. Also cause significant road safety issues on local county roads particularly with regard to the frequent vehicular and pedestrian congestion outside the school;
- understand development of a similar nature was closed at Caistor due to the harm this operation was causing to the residential amenity of the area;
- consider that strong policy support exists to support the above concerns;
- sets out the planning history of the site including the 2008 appeal decision which is set out in the committee report;
- gives a detailed assessment of the proposed traffic generation, noting that the appeal decision imposed a condition restricting the number of vehicle movements to 40 per day. The appeal decision restricted the days and times vehicles could visit the site, noted that the applicant seeks to work on Saturdays which was beyond that permitted on appeal.

Produced figures on predicted vehicle movements to deliver 50,000 tonnes waste per annum based on two scenarios, assuming an ‘8 wheel’, 32 tonnes gross weight would result in 97 vehicle movements per week. If smaller vehicles were used (7.5 tonnes gross weight) would result in 350 vehicles per week. Having seen the highways officer response and taking into account the above do not consider that all of the impacts outlined above have been fully assessed.

Set out the policy framework including reference to PPS7 which sets out the weight that should be given to the AONB status in planning applications. Do not consider the proposal meets the policy objective set out in PPS7. Also sets out policies from the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review and Waste Local Plan policies considered relevant in this case.

Concludes that it has been demonstrated that this application is contrary to numerous policies in local and national guidance which protect small settlements, rural areas, open countryside and AONBs from this sort of development. Consider this proposal and its

associated effects would be inappropriate development. If allowed would create a significant and detrimental impact on local area, a beautiful and tranquil environment. Amenity of local residents would be significantly compromised and safety may also be at risk. Should the proposal be permitted would create a dangerous precedent for future development of Brookenby and other areas sharing similar characteristics and designation and this should be taken into consideration.

Parish Councillor Richard Fry, Chairman of Binbrook Parish Council, an objector, was permitted to speak to the Committee and made the following comments:-

1. Referred to a petition signed by approximately 300 residents which made reference to large HGVs being used at similar sites by the same company. Therefore, air pollution and use of HGVs on narrow roads.
2. The statistics provided for the number of HGVs to be used to move the tonnage of waste could not be reconciled (40 vehicles per week) and 80 plus vehicles was likely to be the number required.
3. Binbrook was a Conservation Area and there would be noise and vibration from HGVs passing through the Market Place.
4. Binbrook was a centre for cycling and walking and HGVs would have a detrimental effect.
5. Binbrook school was on the route of the HGVs and they would be passing the school when children would be arriving and leaving school.
6. The roads in the area were not suitable for HGVs and this was an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Andy Hey, representing the applicant, was permitted to speak to the Committee and made the following comments:-

1. Stated that the comments made by Edward Leigh MP, in connection with traffic going to and from the site passing through Binbrook and Tealby were incorrect. Restrictions would be in place to prevent HGVs going past the school during school hours.
2. A concrete apron already existed on the site.
3. B2 and B8 use existed on the site already. The only elements were a shredder and collection point for metals which were not permitted by West Lindsey Council.
4. There was dust suppression. Made reference to the Penfold report which stated that the same application should not be considered twice and the need to avoid red tape.
5. While this application was in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty the site was isolated and therefore noise would not affect anyone.
6. The hangers which existed at the site were very large and therefore the effect on amenity was insignificant.
7. There was no contamination.

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
14 FEBRUARY 2011**

8. Employment would be created from the business.

Councillor B W Keimach, the local Member for Brookenby, was permitted to speak and made the following comments:-

1. The residents of Brookenby were against the application.
2. The West Lindsey Council shared the concerns of the Lincolnshire Wolds Service about the impact of the scheme on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
3. The effect of HGVs on local roads and the amenity of neighbouring villages.
4. The proposed height of the bunds around the site would have an impact on views.
5. Arbitrary nature of sub divisions in front of the hangers. There was a proposal for woodland planting and measures to accommodate plants.
6. If the concrete base was to be broken up there would be noise, dust and where would the spoil go?
7. The airfield was part of a memorial site visited by tourists and in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty with lovely views.
8. The number of HGVs proposed would affect the amenity of the site. The threshold should be 40 HGVs movements to accord with the Inspector's report.

(NOTE:- Councillor I G Fleetwood declared a personal interest as a member of West Lindsey Council and Chairman of the Local Development Framework).

Councillor C E H Marfleet, representing a neighbouring Division, was permitted to speak and made the following comments:-

1. The application site was a technical park not an industrial park.
2. Pre-break down there was air space in transit, as waste not compacted, therefore could not get maximum weight on HGVs, leading to more HGVs hauling the proposed tonnage.
3. Effects of noise which the Environmental Health Officer had expressed concern about.
4. Noise from HGVs going up hills.
5. Litter from plastics and wood in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
6. Effects on views as this was a memorial site and part of our heritage.
7. The applicant had a site at Manby which was more suitable for this type of development.

Councillor A H Turner MBE, representing a neighbouring Division, was permitted to speak and made the following comments:-

1. Gave an example at Caistor of a similar development operated by the same company where there had been noise, pollution and disturbance for local residents.
2. Effects on health.

Comments made by the Committee included the following:-

1. Was there a need for the site?
2. Loss of amenity in the locality was significant and in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
3. The applicant should be asked to examine a more suitable site served by better roads.
4. The Committee had a moral responsibility for the people who lived in the local villages and to prevent HGVs using the narrow roads.
5. This was a memorial site visited by tourists and was unsuitable for this type of development.

The Executive Director for Communities stated that there was no odour associated with the application as it was not proposed to compost the shredded wood at the site and any shredded material would be removed quickly from the site; the track record of an operator of a similar in another area could not be taken into consideration in the determination of this application and if permission was granted the site would be monitored and enforcement carried out if necessary.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be refused for the reasons detailed in the report.

- (2) To extend a building at an existing waste recycling facility to house an additional baling machine and feeder at Outgang Road, Baston - PMK Recycling Ltd - S7/2894/10

(NOTE:- Councillor T M Trollope-Bellew declared a personal interest as he had attended the meeting of the Parish Council when the application had been discussed).

Since the publication of the report responses to consultation had been received as follows:-

Local Business – no objection but would like to see measures put in place to control Litter including a litter pick around the outside of all units on a daily basis.

10
PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
14 FEBRUARY 2011

Local Resident – note that currently noise associated with the existing development is of concern and question if this proposal will make the problem worse.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

- (3) To continue to extract sand and gravel without complying with condition 3 of planning permission S7/1083/03 at Manor Pit, Baston - Cemex UK Operations Ltd - S7/2737/10

Since the publication of the report a response to consultation had been received as follows:-

Local Business – No objection but suggest a condition is imposed to power sweep the highway at the end of each working day to prevent slurry in the wet and dust in the dry. This is a requirement for construction sites and should also apply to quarries.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be granted to continue to extract sand and gravel without complying with condition number 3 of planning permission reference number S7/1083/03 subject to all the other conditions set out in that Decision Notice, so far as there are still subsisting and capable of having effect, except condition numbers 2,5 and 14 and subject to replacement conditions detailed in the report.

- (4) For the erection of a gypsum bagging and storage building and two gypsum storage silos, and retrospective planning permission is sought for the change of use of two warehouses for the storage and processing of plasterboard for recycling, siting of external plant and machinery, two conveyors between the warehouses, control room, car parking, landscaping, office and two weighbridges at the Warehouse Complex, Wilsford Heath, Wilsford - Mid UK Recycling Ltd - N74/1365/10

(NOTE:- Councillor I G Fleetwood stated that his wife had had dealings with JHG Planning Consultants in the distant past but felt that he could now speak and vote on the application).

Mr Oliver Grundy, representing the applicant, was permitted to speak to the Committee and made the following comments:-

1. Policy WLP5 was a sticking point as this policy had a strategic role.

2. Questioned that if item 5.5 on the agenda had come before this item whether the Committee would be arriving at a different decision.
3. The application was ideally located for customers and producers.
4. It was proposed to transfer the current business from Caythorpe.
5. The waste could no longer be land filled.
6. Referred to Policy 38(6) which made reference to applications being determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Executive Director for Communities stated that it was important to realise that the application was retrospective and that highways had requested that a S278 Agreement should be in place to deal with issues of access could not be undertaken before the site was brought into use. To address this, the recommendation to grant permission on item 5.5 was subject to a condition that planning permission was implemented once the highway works were completed. This would not be achieved.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That consideration of the application be deferred to the next meeting and until the Committee had made a decision on minute 87(5), at today's meeting.

(NOTE:- Councillors T M Trollope-Bellew, H R Johnson and K Milner abstained from voting as they had not been present in the room during the discussion thereon).

- (5) For an extension to an existing building and retrospective planning permission is sought for the change of use of two warehouses for processing, storage and transfer of material for energy recovery, the siting of external plant and machinery, car parking, landscaping, office and two weighbridges at the Warehouse Complex, Wilsford Heath, Wilsford - Mid UK Recycling Ltd - N74/1374/10

The Executive Director for Communities explained the differences between this application and that detailed in minute 87(4) adding that this was an application to breakdown plastics and other materials into smaller units and then to remove them from the site. The nature of the materials had not changed and did not require to meet the requirements of B2 use. In the case of minute 87(4), the highway improvements needed to be done before the application proceeded.

Mr Oliver Grundy, representing the applicant, was permitted to speak to the Committee and made the following comments:-

1. The existing site at Caythorpe was inadequate and therefore this site was preferred.
2. The access would be improved.

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
14 FEBRUARY 2011**

3. Extant B8 use existed at this site.

Councillor N D Cooper, in moving the recommendation in the report, seconded by Councillor I G Fleetwood, stated that vehicle movements should not be permitted on either a Sunday or Bank Holidays to protect the amenity of local residents. The proposal to restrict vehicle movements on a Sunday and Bank Holidays was defeated by six votes to five votes.

Councillor D R Dickinson, seconded by Councillor H R Johnson, moved the recommendation in the report and it was -

RESOLVED (10 for, one against and one abstention)

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

- (6) To seek retrospective permission to increase the height of existing barrier by 2.5m with nylon mesh at Cherry Holt Road, Bourne – Bourne Skip Hire and Recycling – S12/2895/10

Since the publication of the report a response to consultation had been received as follows:-

Local Business – no objection to the height of the fence but are concerned about its construction because do not consider it is safe and sleepers are of irregular heights of the overall fencing if the netting goes to 2.5m.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be granted subject to the condition detailed in the report.

- (7) To vary condition 2 of planning permission S12/0894/08, drawing No. 2557/5A, to reduce the size of the building to measure 30m long x 18m wide x 10m high at Cherry Holt Road, Bourne - Bourne Skip Hire and Recycling - S12/2869/10

Since the publication of the report a response to consultation had been received as follows:-

Local Business – concerns that the applicant have requested to erect a smaller new building and question if the reduction in size of the existing building is still going to take place as if it does have concerns over where the waste from out of the existing building is going to go. Also question the design and materials proposed to be used in the building.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be granted to continue to develop land in accordance with the Council's Decision Notice reference S12/0894/08 dated 27 October 2008 without complying with condition number 2 but subject to all conditions set out in that Decision Notice, so far as these are still subsisting and capable of having effect, and subject to the new condition detailed in the report.

- (8) For the change the use of former agricultural buildings and farmyard to form the premises for an arboricultural business to operate, including office space, the storage and maintenance of associated vehicle/plant/equipment, a small scale material recovery facility and internal and external storage of tree surgery waste, raw materials and recycled biomass product. The application is applied for in part retrospectively at Poplar Farm, Dunston Fen - Mr H Bavin - N26/0056/11

Since the publication of the report a response to consultation had been received as follows:-

Dunston Parish Council – have concerns and following comments:-

- Fen Lane is not suitable for heavy transport;
- no passing places on this single track road;
- large vehicles transporting trees etc danger to all other road users on this road;
- blockage of round due to offloading;
- noise of machines;
- fire risk to adjoining residential property;
- safety issues to residents and environment of Dunston;
- disturbance to residents of Dunston; and
- this is not an industrial area.

Environment Agency – no objection but draws applicant's attention to the fact that this treatment of waste wood would require an exemption or permit and the plan to use a package plant will require an exemption to discharge to surface water or groundwater.

Witham 1st Internal Drainage Board – not anticipate will adversely affect the standard of drainage within the immediate vicinity.

English Heritage – the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance and on the basis of specialist conservation advice.

Local Residents – further 12 letters of objection have been received essentially raising the same points outlined in the committee report. One further point raised is that the bridge at the junction of Front Street, Middle Street and Fen Road has been damaged

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
14 FEBRUARY 2011**

twice by large lorries and is too narrow for them. Further comment about inadequate condition of the road to accommodate a development of this nature.

Reference is made to the route vehicles would travel to access the site through Dunston Fen which would involve negotiating tight bends which would be difficult for articulated vehicles.

Concern that this is a retrospective application and the applicant has been operating from this site for sometime which is of concern showing a belligerent attitude and gives the impression they can operate how they want.

This is an agricultural not industrial area and cannot see a need for such a change of use when many existing brown field sites with good vehicle access remain vacant. Noise travels some distance in this landscape before diminishing, continuous noise from wood cutting machinery and loading and off loading of vehicles is not welcome.

Local Resident – objects and provides detailed review of current activities, in particular notes that although applicant makes a commitment to cease working, this has not been the case and operations have continued.

- Disputes the claim that the site has recently been used for intensive farming operations with associated traffic movements;
- sets out conflict with development plan policies due to vibration of property when vehicles pass, visual intrusion and noise nuisance due to the proposed activities and the nature of the machinery;
- issue with vermin;
- local highway network is not suitable without improvements to the highway such as passing places;
- foliage is not bagged and removed from the site it is burnt;
- conflicts with countryside protection policies;

- disputes the claims made by the applicant regarding the previous intensive agricultural use of the application site and has never been used to the intensity as claimed by the applicant. Also disputes the assertions made by the applicant that the barns were previously used as a car repair workshop, other than a low level use to renovate a classic car. Not aware that a noisy grain dryer was situated on the site.

- should permission be granted it would create considerable problems for all those that live around. The business will grow due to the nature of the product and market forces that are growing for this type of produce, it is likely to double in size within 2 years but the location does not support the required infrastructure to support it. Create a precedent for other businesses to move in once this becomes established. Property values, the highway, visual

impact and noise would be issues if permission is granted and see no evidence from any information submitted that would address the problems.

Historic Environment Team (Lincolnshire County Council) – note the proposed access route runs alongside scheduled earthwork remains of Car Dyke in Nocton Wood. This is an artificial water channel constructed around AD125. Most of its length has however been incorporated with modern drainage systems and very little of it survives well.

Highways – still require confirmation and evidence regarding the level of vehicle movements associated with the past agricultural activity at the site. Verifiable information should also be provided relating to vehicle types associated with the proposed use class.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be refused for the reasons detailed in the report.

- (9) To change the use of the current former agricultural property to a facility for the transfer and treatment of recyclable domestic and light at Willow Tree Farm, Sykes Lane, Saxilby – W85/126848/11

Since the publication of the report responses to consultation had been received as follows:-

Head of Planning – additional drawing reference to be added to Condition 2.

- Drawing Ref 3929/100 – general arrangements and details received 1st February 2011.
- Additional condition limiting the site throughput to 5,000 tonnes per annum.

West Lindsey District Council – no objection in principle. Request the hours of operation are restricted to those on the application and height of actual storage be limited to protect the visual amenity of the area.

Saxilby with Ingleby Parish Council – note that some additional traffic will be generated otherwise no objection.

Local Resident – object for the following reasons:-

- impact of smoke from fires which have been previously lit on site;
- concerns regarding increase in noise levels and impact on adjacent ménage;
- impact on Sykes Lane both from a highway safety perspective and on the rural nature of the lane;
- fear increase in crime;

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
14 FEBRUARY 2011**

- fear increase of rats and other vermin;
- adverse environmental impact in rural area;
- ask where waste is currently dealt with and why this cannot continue.

Highways – it is considered by the highway authority that the proposed development will not be detrimental to highway safety or traffic capacity. This advice assumes that the planning authority will condition any grant of permission limiting the quantity of waste to no more than 5,000 tonnes per annum.

The Executive Director for Communities reported that the Environment Agency had reported to consultation since the despatch of the update stating that while they had no objections to the application had requested an informative in respect of a need for an Environmental Permit and Drainage requirements.

Comments made by the Committee included:-

1. Had the site already received planning approval as it appeared to be operational?
2. The road serving the site was narrow.
3. 5k tonnes should be the maximum allowed if the application was approved.
4. Any vehicle using the site would be required to use Saxilby High Street which was already a busy thoroughfare.
5. The access to the site was restricted.
6. It was likely that considering the tonnage of waste to be moved the size of the vehicles to be used did not seem large enough and the road was not suitable to take a larger vehicle.
7. Surprised that highways had not suggested a routeing agreement or remedial work.
8. Was it possible to ask the applicant to use the type of vehicle in the photograph displayed at the meeting?

The Executive Director for Communities stated that no planning permission existed at the site already; the applicant wished to bring waste back to the site for sorting; current policy allowed the use of disused farm buildings for waste transfer stations and highways had not objected to the application.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That consideration of the application be deferred pending the provision of more information from highways on whether the road to the site has sufficient capacity.

88. PLANNING APPLICATIONS RELATING TO COUNTY COUNCIL DEVELOPMENTS

The Committee received five reports from the Executive Director for Communities on planning applications relating to County Council developments.

The results of consultations and publicity were detailed in the reports.

- (1) To construct an extension to provide food technology facilities at St Bernard's School, Wood Lane, Louth – (E)N105/2148/10 (minute 76(1), Planning and Regulation Committee, 17 January 2011

Since the publication of the report a response to consultation had been received as follows:-

County Councillor J D Hough – concerned, and assumes this is the same for local residents, about the impact the development will have on the neighbouring house and their amenity.

Note that Local Plan Policy A4 explanatory paragraph makes reference that the Council will negotiate with the applicant to reduce the impact. It is noted that there appears to have been no attempt to have negotiations either with the objector or school to try and reduce the impact on the neighbour's house and garden.

Do not consider that the fact that part of the existing school building is closer to the dwelling than the proposed building should not be a factor – each application should be dealt with separately and the fact that the amenity of the nearby house has already been affected should rather strengthen the case against making it worse.

Acknowledge the importance that the school should have new food technology facilities but it should not be at the expense of the neighbour's enjoyment of their house and in particular their garden.

Request that there should be negotiations with the school and neighbour to see if a solution can be found to deliver new food technology facilities while reducing the damaging effect on the neighbour's amenity.

RESOLVED (unanimous) (NOTE:- Only those members of the Committee who had attended the site visit on 26 January 2011 were able to vote and these were Councillors D Brailsford, D R Dickinson, I G Fleetwood, D C Hoyes, H R Johnson, K Milner, J Swanson, T M Trollope-Bellew and S F Williams)

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
14 FEBRUARY 2011**

- (2) For the repair and alteration of the south curtain wall and Lucy Tower in order to create pedestrian access to the south wall walkway at Lincoln Castle, Lincoln – L/0001/11

Since the publication of the report a response to consultation had been received as follows:-

City of Lincoln Council – no objection to this proposal.

Mr Rob Green, representing the applicant was permitted to speak and made comments as follows:-

1. Presented examples of the materials to be used.
2. Welcomed the content of the Director's report.
3. Explained the proposals to reopen the Castle wall to public access.
4. Explained the consultations with English Heritage.

RESOLVED (unanimous) (NOTE:- Councillors N D Cooper, K Milner, D Brailsford and H R Johnson left the meeting during this item)

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

- (3) To construct a car park and picnic area at Chapel St Leonards Chapel Six Marshes Car Park - (E)S31/2445/10

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

- (4) To erect a portal framed grain store and plant room at West Royalty Farm, Spilsby Road, Eastville - (E)S47/2452/10

RESOLVED (5 for 1 against)

That planning permission be granted subject to a further condition that the building is grey in colour.

No development shall take place until a sample of the material to clad the upper walls of the building hereby permitted, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The material shall be grey in colour. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

- (5) To site a relocatable classroom unit, construct adjoining paved area, erect security fencing, and provide 3no new car parking spaces at St Augustine's Catholic Primary School, Kesteven Road, Stamford - S69/2856/10

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report

The meeting closed at 1.15pm