

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR I G FLEETWOOD (CHAIRMAN)

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

Also in attendance:- Councillors R G Davies (minute 6(1)), M J Hill OBE (minute 6(2)), A N Stokes (observer), W S Webb (Executive Councillor for Highways and Transport) and R Wooten (minute 6(1)).

Officers in attendance: Communities Directorate – Neil McBride (Development Manager) and Steve Willis (Assistant Director - Environment, Planning and Customer Services); Legal – Charlotte Lockwood (Solicitor); Performance and Governance – Steve Blagg (Democratic Services Officer).

An apology for absence was received from Councillor N D Cooper.

1. COUNCILLOR MAJOR RAY NEWELL – NEW MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Major Ray Newell as a new member of the Committee, adding that Councillor Newell had been trained on planning and regulation matters.

2. ALAN FREEMAN, HEAD OF PLANNING - ILLNESS

The Chairman informed the Committee of Alan Freeman's illness and stated that a best wishes card had been circulated for signature to send to Alan. The Committee placed on record its best wishes to Alan and his family and requested that they should be kept informed of developments following Steve Willis's latest prognosis of Alan's position at the meeting.

3. DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLORS' INTERESTS

Councillor T M Trollope-Bellew stated that he had not attended the site visit on 2 April 2012 (minute 6(1)) and would neither take part in any discussion nor voting thereon.

Councillor J M Swanson declared a personal interest as a member of East Lindsey District Council's Planning Committee, in connection with minute 5(3)) and that he was the local Member for minute 5(3)).

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
18 JUNE 2012**

Councillor Major R T Newell stated that as he was not a member of the Committee when the site visit had taken place on 2 April 2012 and would neither take part in the debate nor voting thereon (minute 6(1)).

Councillor S F Williams stated that he had not attended the site visit on 2 April 2012 (minute 6(1)).

Councillor P Bedford declared a personal interest as a member of the Black Sluice Drainage Board as the Board was a consultee (minute 5(3)).

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

4. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 8 May 2012 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS RELATING TO COUNTY MATTER DEVELOPMENTS

(Note: Councillor M Tinker arrived in the meeting).

The Committee received three 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) Retrospective application for the change of use from agriculture to agriculture and use of land for log splitting, storage of timber and cut logs at Manor Farm, Church Street, North Witham – Mr Kevin Russell - S60/3139/11

Joan McHale, an objector, commented as follows:-

1. Access route was narrow for HGVs.
2. Damage to properties caused by HGVs.
3. Some of the properties had shallow foundations and therefore more susceptible to vibration from HGVs.
4. 44 tonne HGVs presented additional problems because of load.
5. Volume of noise.
6. If application was approved the applicant could increase the amount of material brought to the site.

The Executive Director stated that the applicant was restricted by condition on how much material he could bring to the site and it would be necessary for him to submit another planning application if he wished to increase the amount.

The Executive Director responded to comments made by the Committee in connection with the effects of the application on the local highway, evidence of damage to properties, creation of dust and comparisons if the site was still in agricultural use and the implications for vehicular access.

RESOLVED (8 votes for and no votes against)

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

- (2) Section 73 application to vary Conditions No. 2 and 17 of planning permission S60/0125/12 which relate to the existing composting operations being carried out on land off Honey Pot Lane, North Witham, Grantham – Greenworld Sales Ltd – S60/1197/12

Since the publication of the report the Executive Director reported that South Kesteven District Council had responded that they had not got any objection to the application.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be granted subject to all other conditions, except Conditions No. 2 and 17 as set out in the Council's Decision Notice reference S60/0125/10, dated 15 March 2010, so far as the same are still subsisting and capable of taking effect and subject to the new conditions to replace Conditions No. 2 and 17 as detailed in the report.

- (3) Proposed separator building and bio-filter in connection with approved combined heat and power generation plant at Station Farm, Station Road, Sibsey – Staples Brothers Ltd – (E)S152/0911/12

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

East Lindsey District Council – note this proposal involves a limited amendment to an existing approved scheme. The present submission is a relatively minor amendment and will in itself not be visually prominent. No objection is therefore made.

It is noted that there are a number of residential neighbours on the perimeter of the site. If permission is granted consideration needs to be given of the proposal on residential amenity and to ensure that no adverse effects on amenity and living conditions arise through noise, vehicular activity and in particular odour.

4
PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
18 JUNE 2012

Should be mindful of any issues arising from the site location within Flood Zone 3.

Highways – consider that the proposal will not be detrimental to highway safety or traffic capacity.

Richard Wright, an objector, commented as follows:-

1. Smells from the site.
2. Size of the potato store was large.
3. Problems of smells at a similar plant at Wrangle had still not been resolved.

Lewis Smith, representing the applicant, commented as follows:-

1. Explained the technical aspects of the application.
2. Explained the advantages of having a bio-filter and a separator building to deal with methane.
3. The proposal would help soil development.
4. There was not an odour problem at Wrangle.
5. There was no visual impact and the amenity of local residents was not affected.

Comments made by the Committee included the following:-

1. The application for Sibsey had already been approved.
2. An odour management plan had been approved for the site.
3. The proposed alteration did not affect increase the size of the building.
4. The bark filter system was located underground.
5. The comments of the Parish Council were not known but the Clerk to the Parish Council had stated that there was not any objection.
6. There would be a reduction in the risk of smells.

RESOLVED (unanimous)

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

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS RELATING TO COUNTY COUNCIL DEVELOPMENTS

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

- (1) Supplementary Report - To construct new academic buildings for Priory Ruskin Academy and associated landscaping at The Central Technology College, Rushcliffe Road, Grantham – S35/2956/11 (minute 79(1), Planning and Regulation Committee, 8 May 2012)

(Note: Councillor T M Trollope-Bellew left the meeting. Councillor D Brailsford declared a personal interest as the Executive Support Councillor for Children Services and Life Long Learning (minute 6(2)).

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

Priory Ruskin Academy Community – submitted a petition with 600 signatures requesting an end to the uncertainty surrounding this application and that permission should be granted. This will allow students and staff to move forward with their education and plan for the future. After four months of deferral, with the £13.5m already allocated by central government we believe any further delay would be detrimental to the hard work in establishing an excellent learning experience.

Priory Ruskin Academy Students – 12 letters of support have been received from Academy students. In summary these letters raise concern about the delay in making a decision on this application. In addition make reference to the poor standard of the existing school buildings and the difference the new buildings will make to the educational standards as consider that better facilities would result in better education.

Also make reference to the fact that the improved facilities will be made available to the community which is a further positive benefit to the scheme.

Submit that the traffic associated with this project will be no different to traffic on other roads for other local schools so request that permission be granted.

Priory Ruskin Academy Parents – 15 letters of support have been received from parents for the following reasons (summarised):-

- beneficial for pupils at the school;

disappointed by the delays to the scheme caused by the planning process and submit that the access arrangements proposed would not be a problem especially considering the construction period being for a relatively short period of time.

Paul Holmes, representing the applicant commented as follows:-

1. Highways had been consulted at an early stage and they had stated that the route for HGVs was not unacceptable.
2. Highways had stated that the Running Furrows access was not suitable.

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
18 JUNE 2012**

3. The Land Registry had been consulted.
4. Sustrans had been consulted about the Running Furrows route and had stated that this was a safe route used by cyclists and pedestrians.
5. A response from Network Rail about the ownership of land on Running Furrows had not been received.
6. Running Furrows was narrow in places and widening would be expensive.
7. When the new school was completed it would lead to fewer cars parked in the vicinity of the school and therefore improve amenity for local residents.
8. The new school was desperately needed.

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

1. He had a duty to represent the views of local residents.
2. Residents had been concerned about the situation since January 2010.
3. The ownership issues surrounding Running Furrows had still not been resolved.
4. Residents had been informed that the cost of an alternative route was £25k, which was insignificant compared to the total cost of the scheme.
5. Should the Committee be minded to approve the application requested (1) an extension to 16:15 hours, instead of 15:45 hours, when construction traffic was prevented from accessing/egressing Rushcliffe Road (2) Rushcliffe Road should be inspected on a regular basis to repair any damage to the road caused by construction traffic; (3) there should be regular cleaning of Rushcliffe Road and (4) there should be a single point of contact for residents if they had any complaints.
6. He had spoken to the School Council about the planning application.

Councillor R G Davies, a neighbouring local Member, commented as follows:-

1. He was in favour of the application as the school had reached full capacity and additional space was needed.
2. The strategic objectives of Grantham needed to be considered.
3. If the application was not approved a substantial amount of money would be lost.

Comments made by the Committee included:-

1. The concerns of residents about the proposed route of HGVs was understandable.
2. Ownership of Running Furrows was not clear.
3. The legal position in connection with access to Running Furrows.
4. There was a need to concentrate on the planning issues.

RESOLVED (8 votes for and no votes against)

That planning permission be granted subject to:

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
18 JUNE 2012**

(1) The applicant entering into a Unilateral Undertaking to secure financial contributions of up to £110,000 for a cycle lane on Princess Drive; improvements at the junction of Belton Lane and Manthorpe Road to include pedestrian/cycle crossing facilities; a shared use pedestrian/cycle facility along the west side of Manthorpe Road; and bus revenue funding support for the Centrebus Services 3/3A.

(2) Upon completion of the Unilateral Undertaking identified in (A) the Executive Director for Communities be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions detailed in the report subject to Condition 10 being amended by the replacement of “15:45 hours” by “16:15 hours”.

(Note: Councillor D Brailsford left the meeting).

(2) To install a solar photovoltaic system to the modern classroom block at Edenham Church of England School, School Lane, Edenham – S30/0979/12

(Note: Councillor T M Trollope-Bellew returned to the meeting).

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

Head teacher – submitted a letter in support and photographs.

Kris Radford-Rea, an objector, commented as follows:-

1. Small school and financial considerations for the school needed to be considered.
2. The visual impact of the application was low in the local area albeit there was a slight visual effect of some of the panels on School Lane.
3. The old part of the school was a Grade 2 Listed Building.

Councillor M J Hill OBE, the local Member, commented as follows:-

1. The decision of the Parish Council meeting on the application had not been unanimous.
2. The school had a good educational record.
3. The issue was the number and location of the panels on one aspect of the school roof.
4. When the new part of the school was built the planners had stressed the importance of the roof line.
5. Visibility of the panels in the winter from the A151.

Comments made by the Committee included the following:-

1. The application should be either approved or refused.
2. The panels would be visible from the A151 as the road was on a hill.

8

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
18 JUNE 2012**

3. The application was inappropriate in this location.
4. The panels would not cause any visual harm to the existing school building or village.

A motion by Councillor R Hills, seconded by Councillor H R Johnson, that the recommendation of the Executive Director, as detailed in the report, should be approved, was defeated by 5 votes for and 6 votes against.

On a motion by Councillor D R Dickson, seconded by Councillor T M Trollope-Bellew, it was –

RESOLVED (5 votes for and 3 votes against)

That the application be deferred pending consultations between the Executive Director for Communities and the applicant to examine the number and location of the solar photovoltaic system on the modern classroom block at Edenham Church of England Primary School, School Lane, Edenham.

7. OUTCOME OF PLANNING APPEAL – REED POINT, SUTTERTON

The Executive Director for Communities presented a report on the outcome of an appeal following the Council's decision to refuse planning permission for the change of use of the existing haulage yard and workshop and erection of a building for the importation, sorting and baling of end of life tyres and construction of a surface water mitigation scheme and security fence to the boundary at Red Point, Spalding Road, Sutterton, Boston.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

The meeting closed at 12.15pm