

**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, S F Kinch, K Milner, J M Swanson, M Tinker, M T Trollope-Bellew and S F Williams

Also in attendance:- C L Strange (Executive Councillor for Waste Services and Green Issues), W S Webb (Executive Councillor for Highways and Transport) and R Wootten (minute 65))

Officers in attendance: Communities – Alan Freeman, Neil McBride and Steve Willis; Legal – Charlotte Lockwood; Performance and Governance – Steve Blagg

**59. DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLORS' INTERESTS**

It was noted that all members of the Committee had been lobbied in connection with minute 64(1). It was noted that Councillors P Bedford, D Brailsford, M Brookes, N D Cooper, I G Fleetwood, H R Johnson and S F Williams had not attended the site visit on 24 February 2012 and would therefore neither get involved in the discussion nor voting on minute 64(1).

Councillor R Hills declared a personal interest as a member of the Planning Committee of the City of Lincoln Council.

Councillor T M Trollope-Bellew declared a personal interest as he had attended the meeting of the Parish Council when this matter had been discussed and the applicant had made a presentation (minute 64(2)).

Councillor J M Swanson declared a personal interest as a member of East Lindsey District Council's Planning Committee.

Councillor M Brookes declared a personal interest as a member of Kirton Parish Council (minute 61).

Councillor K Milner declared a personal interest as a member of East Lindsey District Council and as the Executive Support Councillor for Highways and Transport.

Councillor D R Dickinson declared a personal interest as his wife was a trustee of the Lincoln Cathedral Fabric Fund (minute 64(5)).

2

**PLANNING AND REGULATION  
COMMITTEE  
12 MARCH 2012**

Councillor H R Johnson declared a personal interest as a member of the Planning Committee of South Holland District Council (minute 64(4)).

Councillor N D Cooper declared a personal interest as Chairman of East Lindsey District Council's Planning Committee, as a member of the Police Authority and Skegness and Burgh le Marsh Town Councils.

Councillor I G Fleetwood declared a personal interest as Deputy Leader of West Lindsey District Council and also as a member of their Planning Committee.

60. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 13 February 2012 and of the site visit to Sturgate Airfield, Cow Lane, Upton on 24 February, be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

61. STATION ROAD/KIME MEWS, KIRTON – PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

The Executive Director for Communities presented a report on objections received following the advertisement of a proposal for waiting restrictions along Station Road/Kime Mews, Kirton.

The report outlined the consultations, objections received and the comments of the Executive Director on the objections received.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the objections be overruled and the proposal for the waiting restrictions on Station Road/Kime Mews, Kirton, be approved.

62. STUMP CROSS, SWINESHEAD – PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF HGVS WAITING IN LAY-BY

The Executive Director for Communities presented a report in connection with an objection received following an advertisement of a proposal for a prohibition of waiting for HGVs in Stump Cross Lay-by, Swineshead.

The report outlined the consultations, the objection received and the comments of the Executive Director on the objection received.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the objection be overruled and the proposed waiting restriction at Stump Cross Lay-by, Swineshead, be approved.

63. TRAFFIC REGULATIONS ORDERS-PROGRESS REVIEW AND PETITIONS RECEIVED

The Executive Director for Communities presented a report in connection with the position on all Traffic Regulation Orders and petitions received since last presented to the meeting.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted and that the petitions be received.

64. PLANNING APPLICATIONS RELATING TO COUNTY MATTER DEVELOPMENTS

The Committee received seven reports from the Executive Director for Communities on planning applications relating to County Matter developments. The responses to consultation were detailed in the reports.

- (1) To deposit and process waste to form compost with a limit of 74,999 tonnes per annum and to develop Phase 2 of the same use as per the 2007 Consent (ref: W46/120477/07) at Sturgate Airfield, Cow Lane, Upton, Gainsborough – Land Network (Gainsborough) Ltd – W46/127834/11(minute 57(1), Planning and Regulation Committee, 13 February 2012)

(Note:- Only the following Councillors were able to participate in the discussion and voting thereon as they had attended the site visit on 24 February 2012 – Councillors D R Dickinson, R Hills, D C Hoyes MBE, S F Kinch, K Milner, J M Swanson, M T Trollope-Bellew and S F Williams. Councillor R Hills, Vice-Chairman, chaired the meeting for this planning application only).

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

Local Residents' Professional Representative (Patrick Cluxton) – copy of letter dated 29 February 2012.

Letter from Lincoln Aero Club – copy letter dated 7 March 2012.

**4**  
**PLANNING AND REGULATION**  
**COMMITTEE**  
**12 MARCH 2012**

Letter on application description – copy letter dated 8 March 2012.

Local Resident – Make further comments in particular related to the letter and attached note submitted by Browne Jacobson dated 9 February 2012 in relation to the following:

- Types of waste streams and if permission is granted only green waste should be permitted
- Consider that a bio-aerosol assessment should be undertaken
- Question if the odour impact can be mitigated
- Suggest that all the complaints made to the EHO were not recorded
- PAS 100 requirement should be the main condition
- Question the effectiveness of odour dispersal system
- Consider that an odour impact assessment should have been undertaken before the application was determined
- Submit that there are more suitable locations where this operation could be undertaken which would not cause any nuisance
- Concern that asbestos has been found on the site and nothing has been done about this
- The nearby airfield should have been consulted, bird strike is a problem
- The access track north to Common Lane could be used as an exit/access and is now leased to the applicant
- The description is for 74,999 tonnes and cannot be controlled by condition
- The access/exit condition is not legal
- The site is a land fill and not a composting site
- If the material is transported off site it is a waste transfer station and should have been considered as such
- The trees along the access road have been removed.

Head of Planning

Response to points raised by Patrick Cluxton, in his letter of 29 February 2012.

- a) Development carried on without consent.

The previous application became unlawful on 25 July 2010 by which time pre commencement conditions should have been complied with. The conditions attached to the 2007 permission also lapsed at that date. There was therefore a breach of planning law, but not a breach of condition.

The possibility of taking enforcement action was considered in relation to the content of Planning Policy Guidance Note 18 and Section 173 (4) (b) of the 1990 Act (as amended by the 1991 Act). The reason for not taking action was that in 2007 planning permission was granted for the operation. Discussions on the need to submit a new application were ongoing during the autumn of 2010 until submission of an application in 2011.

b) Description of development.

The compositing operation is retrospective as the activity was continuing, albeit without permission, at the time the application was made. The point of issue is that the operation had never reached the previously approved maximum of 74,999 tonnes. In this regard the question is does the description refer to the actual level of activity or the whole of what was proposed? If, for example, a building is part erected without complying with pre commencement conditions, would a retrospective application have to be for that part of the standing building, or relate to the whole building of which the extant section is a part?

It is correct that the County Council could have refused to validate the application on the basis that the description was not accurate. However, the above dilemma with regard to the description illustrates why it was accepted.

During the registration of the application discussions were held on the content of the description. The revised description was accepted, although it is correct that if the planning authority consider the description inaccurate or legally unsound it could have been rejected and the application not made valid. Once accepted the description itself is not a reason to refuse (even if it may have been a reason not to validate).

c) Red line boundary.

The plan with the application identifies the site and access road in red. Adjoining land in the ownership of the applicant is edged in blue. The overhead site plan is for illustrative use only and is not part of the application. The plan attached to the report is clearly illustrative in nature.

d) Ancient right of way.

There is no statutory right of way through the application site, although a submission has been made to the County Council seeking designation as a right of way. The track to Common Lane is not identified as the access nor egress track.

**6**  
**PLANNING AND REGULATION**  
**COMMITTEE**  
**12 MARCH 2012**

As there is concern over the potential of opening up the track way to the north it is recommended the following condition be attached to any permission.

“The access road to Cow Lane, shall be the only ingress and egress for vehicles going to and departing from the composting site, other than farm machinery spreading composted material on farmland adjoining the site.”

e) Spreading

Material that has met PAS100 standard would no longer be waste and therefore not subject to the same limitations. Effectively PAS100 material would fall into the same category as any other fertilizer. The legal advisor to the applicant has reaffirmed the intention to move to PAS100.

There is a concern voiced in Mr Cluxton's letter over the potential increase in traffic if the land to receive the compost has reached its capacity for the product. It is considered that Condition 8 stating there should be no retail sales of compost from the site effectively restricts the use of the material to land in the applicant's ownership and therefore this overcomes the concerns of additional traffic movements that would result from off site sales.

f) Nature of the material

Currently the material produced is covered by an Environment Agency Exemption Permit, the material by nature still being in planning and environmental law, waste. When PAS100 is achieved the material would not be waste.

g) Export of material

The Transport Statement submitted by the applicant clearly states that material would be taken off site to be spread on agricultural land in Willingham, Upton and Stow. An increase of a third on traffic movements is indicated in the statement with respect of the additional pad,

h) Planning Conditions

As the development is still ongoing the three year standard condition is not applicable. Pre commencement conditions are therefore replaced by staged approvals for these matters. The development of a secondary pad falls into the category considered above with regard to the description.

The application is for a greater amount than the conditions would allow. The level of composting was established after negotiations with the applicant to reduce the site's capacity. In relation to the test of reasonableness the condition confirms the content of an email from the applicant's agent dated 30 October 2011 (from Mr Martin Smith) that states the total amount of compost the site could handle would be a third more than the 30,000 tonnes per annum stated as the current operational capacity.

i) Access condition

The view is expressed that the condition regarding routeing is unenforceable. Similar conditions exist for quarries within the county and this one is posed upon the proposed routeing of vehicles incorporated in the Design and Access Statement submitted by the applicant. The County Council has investigated such matters at quarry sites in the past and has pursued any breaches found to have sound evidence that have occurred.

j) Missing conditions

- i) Condition 1 relates to the application in which the site is defined. As case law is based upon full compliance with the submitted plans unless raised by the conditions attached to the permission.

It is accepted that Condition 1 should be amended to read:-

"The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details set out in the application received on 13 August 2011, supporting documents received on 8 July 2011 and 16 August 2011 and the email from the agent to the Waste Planning Authority dated 30 October 2011, the Transport Statement dated November 2011 and the accompanying plan TMA/1026/03 received 13 August 2011 or where amendments are made pursuant to the other conditions of this planning permission."

- ii) Spreading. The material is required to be PAS100 compliant, therefore the product would not be waste.
- iii) Other uses. Waste permissions are specific as waste does not benefit from its own use class. Each development is as approved, unique, and cannot be varied except through the formal consideration of an application.

**PLANNING AND REGULATION  
COMMITTEE  
12 MARCH 2012**

- iv) Restriction of vehicle movements. The Highways Officer raised no objections to the level of vehicular movements to and from the site.
  - v) Shredding material. To meet the requirements of PAS100 the operations on site need to follow in a certain order. Due to variable tonnages being deposited at the site, it is considered unreasonable to restrict operational activity in such a way.
  - vi) Noise impact. The District Council Environmental Health Officer raised no objections to the proposal after considering the noise report.
  - vii) Access onto/off Common Lane. See above.
  - viii) Conditions to control tonnages on site at any one time. The difficulty with attaching such detailed conditions is that to enforce them weekly site visits would have to be undertaken. The recommended conditions set out readily understood and clear parameters relating to height and area covered by the operation.
- k) Regional figures for composting
- Work is still ongoing with the Environment Agency over reconciling planning restrictions and permit levels over the East and West Midlands. Lincolnshire has almost completed this process,
- l) Assessment of amount of compost needed in Lincolnshire
- Whilst studies exist on trial sites, each area can only be assessed individually. Apart from exemptions and nitrate sensitive areas the level of fertilization is left to the farmer concerned.

The Executive Director for Communities reported a further update, following legal advice, in connection with the description of the site and additional conditions in connection with road access. The track to the north exiting on to Common Lane was not shown as part of the application site nor within the area of ownership edged in blue. There was no legal declaration required on the land outside the application site. To overcome the concerns raised, a condition was proposed which would restrict access and egress of vehicles involved in the composting operation to the access on to Cow Lane, although farm vehicles spreading material on adjoining farm land would have to be excluded from this restriction.

Following a question from Councillor R Hills, the Executive Director explained that the reduced tonnage had been confirmed in writing by the applicant's agent and therefore considered this to be acceptable. If permission was granted the decision would have to take account of the description, the documentation referred to and the condition, no element being considered separate.

Patrick Cluxton, an objector, commented as follows:-

1. Planning application differed from the description – derogation.
2. Applicant refused to change the description and therefore the application should be refused.
3. Made reference to tonnage of 74,999 in the description and revised limit of 40,000 tonnes being recommended by the planning officer.
4. 74,999 was one tonne below the Environment Agency Limit.
5. Green waste sites depended on demand.
6. Waste arriving on site was not classed as compost until treated.

Stephen Coult, representing the applicant, stated that with regard to derogation and the advice of the planning officer the application was lawful and reflected the outcome of a major planning application.

(Note:- Councillor C L Strange declared a personal interest as a member of West Lindsey District Council and Joint Waste Strategy Group)

Councillor C L Strange, the local Member, was permitted to speak to the Committee and commented as follows:-

1. Spoke as the local member representing the villages of Harpswell and Heapham, although he had received messages from Upton in the next electoral Division.
2. Residents concerned about the proposed continuation and increase of composting on this site.
3. Over 130 complaints were received on the grounds of odour and noise. Had a duty to protect the residents he represented and their quality of life.
4. Traffic movements would increase substantially and highlighted the effects on road structure.
5. The need for restrictions on the routing of vehicles from the site to prevent damage to the highway.
6. The company's offer to accept PAS100 best practice guidance was welcomed.
7. Concerned about the inability of highways to comment on environmental impact and residential amenity.
8. Effects of noise and pollution.
9. Noted that the applicant had not offered any compensating S106 monies
10. It was accepted that the applicant could reapply with a reduced tonnage but with conditions attached to allow examination and temporary operation period to allow monitoring.

**10**  
**PLANNING AND REGULATION**  
**COMMITTEE**  
**12 MARCH 2012**

Comments made by the Committee included:-

1. The grade of the land.
2. Height restriction of vehicles was exceeded.
3. Odour seemed to be from leylandii waste.
4. The material entering the site was green waste but it was noted from the site visit that polythene bags were in the waste.
5. It was accepted that the working conditions might change.
6. The volume of material entering the site was a problem and clarification was sought on any potential problem if the Committee was minded to reduce the amount of waste entering the site.
7. Bird activity was limited at the site albeit that it was noted that it had been raised as an issue by the local airport.
8. The site seemed to be clean and tidy although it was accepted that conditions changed throughout the year especially during the grass cutting season.
9. The addition of wood waste to grass cutting would help the composting process.
10. The site was located a long way from houses.
11. If waste was ploughed into land within 24 hours of its receipt odour would be reduced.
12. The application provided a service to a local authority and therefore should be supported.
13. In addition to green waste, door frames and metals were present, therefore more quality control of waste entering the site was required.
14. There was no evidence from the site visit that door frames in the waste were being turned into green waste.

The Executive Director commented as follows:-

1. There were no details about the grade of land, if the compost met PAS 100 it would no longer be waste and the control of spreading would be for the farmer. At present as the material being spread was exempt, it was therefore the responsibility of the Environment Agency.
2. The 40,000 tonnes had been agreed following consultations with the applicant and any reduction in this figure would have to be agreed with the applicant.
3. Explained "derogation".

A motion by Councillor K Milner, seconded by Councillor J Swanson, that the application should be deferred to allow officers to speak to the applicant in connection with a reduction in the tonnage from 40,000 to 20,000, was not voted upon.

The Chairman proceeded to the recommendation of the officers in the report stating that the Committee had fully considered the matter and that the lowering of tonnage of waste was not part of the application.

On a motion by Councillor R Hills, seconded by Councillor D R Dickinson, it was -

RESOLVED (five votes for and two against)

That the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed in the report and for the reasons outlined in Appendix A (i) (report to the meeting of the Planning and Regulation Committee, 13 February 2012.

- (2) To form a Household Waste Recycling Centre, using the existing concrete surface, comprising the construction of concrete walled bunkers for waste sorting, acoustic fencing along part of north and western boundary of site, metal palisade boundary fence and gates, together with associated roadway markings and bollards at Bradstone Site, Baston Outgang Road, Baston – PMK Recycling Ltd – S7/2760/11 (minute 57(2), Planning and Regulation Committee, 13 February 2012

Since the publication of the report the Executive Director reported that a local resident had expressed concern about traffic movements in the village of Baston but the concerns had been addressed in his report. The Executive Director acknowledged the A road referred to was the A16 and it would be amended in the report and suggested conditions.

Mrs Mort, an objector, commented as follows:-

1. A site visit was required.
2. 71 objections against the application and none in favour.
3. Problems with odour and vermin.
4. Increased traffic through the village.
5. Conflict with pedestrians and school children.
6. Noted that company were making a £40k contribution to local highway improvements but work was also required at sites where speed was an issue.
7. Local roads were sub standard.
8. Use of Sat-Navs took vehicles through the village which was shorter than the recommended route.

Mr Buxton, on behalf of the applicant, commented as follows:-

1. The company had operated in the area since 2006 in the village.
2. There were benefits for local residents in having a Household Waste Recycling Centre.
3. The application was bringing a former industrial site back into use.
4. The application would help waste to be recycled.
5. There were 28 parking spaces at the site.
6. The site was not visible from the village.

**12**  
**PLANNING AND REGULATION**  
**COMMITTEE**  
**12 MARCH 2012**

7. There was sustainable drainage.
8. There would be increased employment opportunities.
9. The company was a good neighbour and had met the Parish Council and highways to explain the proposals.
10. It was proposed to install traffic signage and have a routing agreement.

Following concerns about the traffic implications of the application, it was moved by Councillor T M Trollope-Bellew, seconded by Councillor N D Cooper, and –

RESOLVED (ten votes for and one against)

That consideration of the application be deferred pending a site visit.

- (3) Under the provisions of the Environment Act 1995 all mining sites are subject to periodic review which takes place at 15 year intervals. In accordance with Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 1995, Star Energy (East Midlands) Limited has therefore made an application for the determination of new (updated) conditions to which the Welton A Site, Sudbrooke Road, Scothern is to be subject - W87/128156/11

RESOLVED (unanimous. Councillors T M Trollope – Bellew and K Milner were not present during the discussion or voting thereon).

That the conditions be approved as detailed in the report.

- (4) To vary/remove Conditions 1(i), 1(iii), 1(iv), 2, 3, 12 and 16 of planning permission H2/1061/10 which relates to the construction of an energy production and recycling park at Decoy Farm, Postland Road, Crowland – Organic Recycling (Agent: Robert Doughty Consultancy) - H2/1025/11

Mr Riddington, the applicant, commented as follows:-

1. The system changed from dry to wet for economic reasons and would a better system for the production of methane.
2. The revised system would offer improved control, reduced noise, reduced odour and less landscape was required.
3. The waste tonnage was satisfactory.
4. There would be increased employment opportunities.

RESOLVED (unanimous. Councillor N D Cooper left the meeting)

That the report (including appendices) forms part of the Council's Statement pursuant to Regulation 24 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 – which requires the Council to make available for public inspection at the District Council's offices specified information regarding the decision. Pursuant to Regulation 24 (1) (c) the Council must make available for public inspection a statement which contains:-

- the content of the decision and any conditions attached to it;
- the main reasons and consideration on which the decision is based, including, if relevant, information about the participation of the public;
- a description, when necessary, of the main measures to avoid,
- reduce and if possible offset the major adverse effects of the development;
- information recording the right to challenge the validity of the decision and the procedures for doing so.

(5) To continue to extract limestone for specialist building uses in connection with the repair of Lincoln Cathedral at Cathedral Quarry, Riseholme Road, Lincoln - Dean and Chapter (Agent: Mineral Surveying Services) - L/0475/11

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

Local Resident Four further representations have been received making the following comments summarised:-

- Request the southerly bund remains as this forms an integral part of the site. The southerly bund also blocks some of the view of the workshops.
- Request planting of semi mature trees along the southern boundary with associated maintenance. This will encourage local wildlife.
- Aware of the possibility of the applicant undertaking a land swap for the allotments. If this is a possibility for restoration do not wish to raise any objection or for use as a wildlife reserve.
- Concern that the required tree planting has not been maintained and allowed to fail does cause concern about further requirements that could be imposed
- Support the restoration of the site to a wildlife use or land swap for the allotments

Head of Planning – in respect of the retention of the southern bund, the applicant proposes to remove this to provide a soil resource to aid restoration. They are not permitted to import soil which is restricted by proposed Condition 2 and the southern bund does not have established landscaping/tree cover as the east/west bund and therefore its removal would be more appropriate. However proposed

**14**  
**PLANNING AND REGULATION**  
**COMMITTEE**  
**12 MARCH 2012**

Condition 2 requires full restoration scheme to be submitted for approval and a view can be taken at that time as whether or not to retain the southern bund can be taken then.

To address the concerns regarding the failure of the existing planting, a further condition to be imposed as follows:-

Within three months of the date of this permission a scheme for the retention, strengthening and management of all existing landscape planting bordering the quarry shall be submitted for the written approval of the Minerals Planning Authority. The approval detail shall be implemented in full for the duration of the development.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report and the additional condition approved at the meeting as follows:-

Condition:- Within three months of the date of this permission a scheme for the retention, strengthening and management of all existing landscape planting bordering the quarry shall be submitted for the written approval of the Minerals Planning Authority. The approval detail shall be implemented in full for the duration of the development.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

- (6) For small-scale lateral extensions to Red Barn Quarry, Castle Bytham-Bullimores Sand and Gravel Ltd (Agent: Heaton Planning Ltd) - S19/0530/11

RESOLVED (unanimous)

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

- (7) To continue to use land as a waste transfer station and recycling centre at Lissinglea Farm House, Lissington – Pages Skip Hire Limited - W60/127836/11

Since the publication of the report and update the Executive Director for Communities reported the receipt of a letter from the applicant (Pages Skip Hire Ltd), dated 8 March 2012, detailing a number of errors and omissions in the report of the Executive Director.

Mr Page, the applicant, commented as follows:-

1. Work was carried out as described in the enforcement notice but not carried out to the letter.
2. Most of the planning conditions were met.
3. The planners had identified issues with five items:- (a) Soil bund was not constructed properly despite supplying the soil used; (b) Litter net not erected properly despite being erected; (c) A wheeler cleaner had been installed and was serviceable; (d) Hedging had been planted but the wrong plants had been used and (e) a small portion of hard standing area was not complete.
4. Creation of additional employment for local people.
5. There was not an alternative site.

Comments made by the Committee included:-

1. The firm had been in operation for ten years at this site.
2. No neighbours were objecting.
3. Jobs would be created if the application was approved.
4. The application was in open countryside but seemed to be well screened and bunded despite the application being refused and then the appeal by the applicant being upheld.
5. The applicant had failed to meet the conditions.
6. There was not any mention of Policy PPS1 in the Local Waste Plan, in the report.
7. The history of the site.
8. It was possible that if the application was moved to an industrial estate it could cause problems to existing businesses.
9. The current site needed to be tidied up.
10. There was a need to come up with enforceable conditions before the site was operational.
11. The application should be deferred to allow the applicant time to meet the conditions.
12. Grampian conditions should be imposed on the applicant.

The Executive Director stated that there were significant breaches of the conditions by the applicant; that the Environment Agency had also raised objections; the Waste Local Plan had not been in place when the first application had been submitted; policies were now in place which prevented development in the open countryside and covered re-location to industrial estates; explained the history of the site and was concerned that any grampian conditions would be difficult to apply.

A motion by Councillor H R Johnson, seconded by Councillor N D Cooper, it was –

**16  
PLANNING AND REGULATION  
COMMITTEE  
12 MARCH 2012**

RESOLVED (nine votes for and four against)

That consideration of the application be deferred pending discussions with the applicant on the application of grampian conditions to the application.

65. PLANNING APPLICATIONS RELATING TO COUNTY COUNCIL DEVELOPMENTS

The Committee received four reports from the Executive Director for Communities on planning applications relating to County Council developments. The responses to consultation were detailed in the reports.

- (1) To construct new academic buildings for Priory Ruskin Academy and associated landscaping at The Central Technology College, Rushcliffe Road, Grantham – S35/2956/11 (minute 58(2), Planning and Regulation Committee, 13 February 2012

The Executive Director stated that since the last meeting highways had responded to the issues raised by the Committee at its last meeting and their comments were detailed in the report.

Councillor R Wootten, local Member, commented as follows:-

1. Residents supported the application but had concerns about construction traffic.
2. Affect of school activities beyond the school day.
3. Concerns had been raised by all residents about the need for a second access.
4. Running Furrows was wide enough to create a separate footpath and there was not a problem with Tree Preservation Orders.
5. The Travel Plan was unrealistic as parents would still continue to transport their children to school by car.
6. The effects on the structure of Rushcliffe Road by HGVs.

A motion by Councillor D R Dickinson, seconded by Councillor M Brookes, it was –

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That consideration of the application be deferred pending a site visit.

- (2) To install Solar Photovoltaic roof mounted system to provide the building with a renewable energy source at The Collection, Danes Terrace, Lincoln - L/0033/12

RESOLVED (unanimous)

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

- (3) To change the use of part of sports pavilion to provide extended provision childcare centre, with minor external changes to the building and external works including the erection of fencing and construction of external play areas at The Pavilion, Carlton Boulevard, Lincoln - L/0028/12

RESOLVED (unanimous)

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

- (4) To extend and remodel office building and provide formalised parking area at Highways Depot, Hemingby Lane, Horncastle - (E)S86/0194/12

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

Highways – Request an additional condition as follows:-

The arrangements shown on the approved plan P.03 dated 24 October 2011 for the parking/turning/manoeuvring/loading/unloading of vehicles shall be available at all times when the premises are in use.

Reason: To enable calling vehicles to wait clear of the carriageway of Hemingby Lane and to allow vehicles to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report and the additional conditional approved at the meeting as follows:-

Condition:- The arrangements shown on the approved plan P.03 dated 24 October 2011 for the parking/turning/manoeuvring/loading/unloading of vehicles shall be available at all times when the premises are in use.

Reason: To enable calling vehicles to wait clear of the carriageway of Hemingby Lane and to allow vehicles to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety.

**18**  
**PLANNING AND REGULATION**  
**COMMITTEE**  
**12 MARCH 2012**

The meeting closed at 1.15pm.