

**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
29 JULY 2019**

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR I G FLEETWOOD (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors T R Ashton (Vice-Chairman), L A Cawrey, Mrs J E Killey, D McNally, Mrs A M Newton, Mrs M J Overton MBE, N H Pepper, S P Roe, P A Skinner, H Spratt, M J Storer and C L Strange

Councillors: Dr M E Thompson attended the meeting as observers

Officers in attendance:-

Jeanne Gibson (Programme Leader: Minor Works and Traffic), Neil McBride (Head of Planning), Marc Willis (Applications Team Leader), Rachel Wilson (Democratic Services Officer) and Mandy Withington (Solicitor)

10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor D Brailsford.

11 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

The following declarations of interest were noted:

Councillor L A Cawrey declared an interest in item 6.1 as she was a member of North Kesteven District Council (NKDC) and sat on the Planning Committee. NKDC had been consulted twice on this matter, in June and September, however, Councillor Cawrey left the September meeting before this item was heard. She was the vice-chairman for the 27 June 2019 meeting, but did not vote and declared an interest as a County Councillor.

Councillor S P Roe declared an interest in item 5.1 as the road was adjacent to the entrance of his mother's farm. He also declared an interest in item 6.1 as his daughter and son-in-law owned a house within 300 yards of the site. Councillor Roe advised that he would leave the meeting for consideration of these two agenda items.

Councillor T R Ashton declared that in relation to item 7.1, he was a member of the South East Local Plan Committee, but his appointment was subsequent to the publication of the local plan, and he has not stated his view.

Councillor Mrs A M Newton declared an interest as a member of South Holland District Council and advised that she had been lobbied on both applications, but they were not within her County Council wards. However the application for Section 5 did form part of her district ward. She advised that she had made comments on the

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
29 JULY 2019

application on behalf of residents, but did make it clear at the time they were the views of the residents.

Councillor H Spratt declared an interest in item 5.1 as it was within his area and had been campaigning for two years for this change. He advised that he would leave the meeting for consideration of this item.

(NOTE: Councillor H Spratt left the meeting at 10.40am and did not return as he had not been in attendance for the site visits)

Councillor N H Pepper declared an interest as a member of South Holland District Council, however he was not a member of the Planning Committee, but he had been lobbied in relation to the applications listed under item 7.1.

Councillor M J Overton MBE declared an interest in agenda item 6.1 as a member of North Kesteven District Council, as the planning application had been sent to the district council for comment. Councillor Mrs Overton had been to a number of district council meetings and briefings on this application. She had attended the site visit and received the report and was approaching this item with an open mind.

12 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE HELD ON 1 JULY 2019

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 July 2019 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

13 MINUTES OF THE SITE VISIT HELD ON 22 JULY 2019

RESOLVED

That the inutes of the site visit held on 22 July 2019 be received.

14 TRAFFIC ITEMS

14a Lincoln, Hykeham Road and St Margaret's Gardens - Proposed Waiting Restrictions

(NOTE: Councillor S P Roe left the meeting at this point in the meeting)

The Committee received a report which set out objections received to the proposed waiting restrictions for Lincoln, Hykeham Road and St Margaret's Gardens which were publicly advertised from 28 February to 28 March 2019.

The report outlined the existing conditions and the objections received as well as the comments of officers on the objections received.

Members were provided with the opportunity to ask questions to the officers present in relation to the information contained within the report and some of the comments made included the following:

- It was a positive to see that a public meeting had been held, and this scheme should be applauded at this location.
- Parking outside schools was an issue nationally for a lot of schools, as people complained about parents dropping off and picking up children. It was suggested this was due to parents now having a choice of which school to send their children to and so a lot of children were dependent on their parents to take them to school by car.
- It was accepted that this was an issue that existed in many towns and villages across the county, and welcomed the work that had been carried out by officers to resolve the situation in this area.

On a motion by Councillor T R Ashton, seconded by Councillor P A Skinner, it was:-

RESOLVED (10 in favour, 1 Abstention)

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

15 COUNTY MATTER APPLICATIONS

- 15a For the demolition of the existing animal by-products processing plant and all associated installations; and the construction of a new animal by-products processing plant, comprised of: raw material reception and processing buildings; engineers building; boiler house; oxidiser building and flue; DAF plant; effluent treatment plant; bio filter bed; general office; weighbridge and weighbridge office; hardstanding areas for accessing the processing plant and for parking of cars, commercial vehicles and trailers used in connection with the operation; residential development to provide three environmentally sustainable eco affordable homes and one manager's house for the processing plant; alterations to the existing site access from Jerusalem Road; and all associated development, including landscaping at Jerusalem Farm, Jerusalem Road, Skellingthorpe - DS Developing Ltd (Agent: MAZE Planning Solutions) - 18/0709/CCC

The Committee received a report which sought planning permission by DS Developing Ltd for the demolition of the existing animal by-products processing plant and all associated installations; and the construction of a new animal by-products processing plant, comprised of: raw material reception and processing buildings; engineers building; boiler house; oxidiser building and flue; DAF plant; effluent treatment plant; bio filter bed; general office; weighbridge and weighbridge office; hardstanding areas for accessing the processing plant and for parking of cars; commercial vehicles and trailers used in connection with the operation; residential development to provide three environmentally sustainable eco affordable homes and one manager's house for the processing plant; alteration to the existing site access

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
29 JULY 2019

from Jerusalem Road; and all associated development, including landscaping at Jerusalem Farm, Jerusalem Road, Skellingthorpe.

It was reported that further to the publication of the agenda, a letter from the applicant, a representation from Newark and Sherwood District Council and a further representation from a local resident had been received and were set out in the update which had been circulated to the Committee the previous Friday.

Officers guided members through the report and set out the main issues to be considered in the determination of this application.

Mr James Birch, spoke on behalf of Doddington Parish Council as an objector to the application and made the following points:

- The recommendation to refuse permission based on 6 planning criteria was applauded.
- The rendering plant was only in Skellingthorpe for historical reasons, it was believed that if this was a green field application there was no possible way that the Council would authorise a new plant beside a village of 4000 people and in line of sight of Lincoln Cathedral and a mile from Doddington Hall, a tourist attraction with 300,000 visitors per year.
- It was hoped a combination of stronger environmental laws, climate change resistance and common sense would mean this facility was forced to close in the next 30 years. If the rebuilding of the plant was allowed, it was an endorsement of a plant on this inappropriate site for a long time into the future.
- There were claims that newer equipment would mean a less noxious atmosphere, it was the transporting lorries which were the real problem. The applicant claims that the output level of the new facility would be the same as the current one. That was clearly not the plan. The LEO Group had spent £6m on the freehold of the site and would have to spend at least another £20m building the new plant and then demolishing the old one. They were sophisticated business people and were not going to invest £26m for no increase in revenue. It could be concluded that the new plant would either have a much higher output or they would decide to keep the old facility once the new one was up and running.
- The scale of the proposed investment would logically mean that a new plant would mean more output and that would mean far more lorries smelling badly and congesting the small village roads.
- This planning application was a cover for a struggle for control of the site between the new freeholder Leo Group and the current tenant Lincoln Proteins who had a lease until 2041, but did not bid enough when the freehold came up for sale. The four houses applied for on the site were only there because Leo Group could terminate the tenants lease if planning permission for housing became available on the site.

No questions were asked to the objector.

John Drabble spoke on behalf of the applicant and made the following points:
Housing

- He would review housing, transport, odour and noise.
- Members would be aware of the site's close proximity to Skellingthorpe village, and that the previous NKDC Local Plan settlement boundary passed along the Jerusalem Road frontage, well past the area now proposed for housing. The application site was not in an *isolated area of countryside*, which was the relevant NPFF reference. This was conveyed in the before and after images of the site development. The proposed housing was a component of a larger regeneration scheme that could provide environmental benefits.
- There would be no greater operational movements than currently – there was no stated intensification. The report concluded no adverse impacts on capacity or safety, accord with relevant Policies, and a s106 Agreement could be secured to prevent HGV's travelling through the village.

Odour

- In terms of odour, the Officer report misrepresented the odour assessment. The submissions made it clear that the most stringent of the odour benchmarks was assessed.
- The use of real measured emissions data from an operational plant, using 3 lines not 2 was entirely appropriate and robust.
- The worse-case, maximum odour concentration did not exceed the most stringent odour standard at any existing or proposed property.
- The existing plant processed Category 1, 2 and 3 material and used older, less efficient abatement plant than proposed. Vehicles would be modern, enclosed with hydraulic covers. The weighbridge would be deeper into the site, with passing possible so the potential for queuing would be reduced.

Noise

- In terms of noise, the applicant's Regulation 25 response was compliant with BS4142, contrary to the report.
- Night time HGV movements would result in a negligible impact above existing background
- On short term concurrent operations during commissioning, a restriction on noisy commissioning activities at night time could be conditioned.
- Existing properties would be 2 to 3 times more distant from the nearest process building in the proposed site configuration. The short term commissioning process could be suitably managed.

In closing,

- On housing, members would be aware that the Court of Appeal clarified NPFF Policy, in that proposals *cannot be considered to be isolated if there are other dwellings nearby*. The dwellings would not suffer from poor amenity. The Manager's house was not an operational requirement, and could be omitted.
- There were no objections raised by statutory bodies – Highways England and LCC Highways Authority, the Environment Agency, Natural England or Historic England.
- There were benefits to the proposals, including improved air emissions, an improved and safer site access, better screening for noise, benefits in visual impact and no significant environmental effects as detailed in the 850 page ES. The assessments were not deficient, and the applicant fully accepts appropriate conditions to manage construction and operations.

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE**29 JULY 2019**

Members were provided with the opportunity to ask questions to the applicant and the following was noted:

- It was queried why it was thought the odour assessment was not correct. It was noted that the moderate odour benchmark was 3, and the odour on site was 1.5.
- The model was based on the highest recorded emissions.
- The applicant was asked to explain how the proposed processes were different to the current ones and how this would lead to a reduction in odour. The Committee was advised that there were three categories of waste, and the Penrith plant processed category three only. This site would process categories 1, 2 and 3. The odours would be controlled by a thermic oxidation process.
- The new plant would also be compliant with BAT and environmental permits.
- Emissions would also be improved as it was proposed to include a mains gas connection for fuel. The current plant used tallow fuel.
- It was commented by one member that this was a commercial site, yet there were plans for four dwellings, the reasoning behind a managers house was accepted, but the reasoning for the additional three dwellings was queried.
- It was queried why an alternative access had not been included. Members were reminded that as this was the access outlined in the application, an alternative could not be suggested. It was proposed to improve the existing access to the site to allow HGV's to pass each other.
- It was queried whether there was an intention to increase throughput at the new facility. It was acknowledged that this was an investment by the applicant, but they did not need to increase throughput in order to increase profit. An increase in throughput was not required to make the plant viable.
- In relation to odour, members were advised that stringent and offensive were the same measure.
- The site had to comply with current operational conditions, but for the new site, the environmental permitting would be more stringent.
- It was very important to understand the expected odour and what level the smell would be in the future if the application was approved. The new site would be significantly further back than the current one was. The nearest properties were 115 and 118m from the existing processing buildings, when the new site was built they would be 290 and 336m away. The new property would be 188m from the nearest processing building. The odours would be improved due to the thermal oxidation process as it was a vastly improved method of destroying the odours that it captured.
- The new build would need to be completely enclosed and would have a negative pressure air lock so the odour could not escape. This would be covered by the environmental permit.

The Committee was provided with the opportunity to discuss the application and information presented and some of the points raised included the following:

- It was commented that the tour of the site was very interesting, but it was highlighted that the odour on the site was very strong, and one member commented they were shocked by the strength of the odour.

- It was highlighted that at the time of the visit, one of the doors of the facility was partly open and it was difficult to determine whether this had contributed to the strength of the odour.
- It was noted that if there was an opportunity for a new modern building that was able to get rid of the smell and the noise and was better controlled and further from the village and something could be put in place to manage traffic, then the Committee would need to approve it. However, there was not the assurance that the new facility would deliver on any of these factors.
- It was acknowledged that the site was licensed with the Environment Agency.
- There was a need to make a decision based on the application as presented, and a member commented that they could not support the application as presented, and would agree with the officer recommendation for refusal.
- Another member commented that on balance of what they had heard, they were happy to second the motion to refuse.
- The main issue was the residential element, which was not just outside of the local plan policies but would be located next to one of the most offensive forms of industrial process. Members commented that they were pleased to have had the opportunity to visit the site and appreciated that the properties were incredibly close to the location of the facility.

On a motion by Councillor L A Cawrey, seconded by Councillor T R Ashton, it was:-

RESOLVED (6 in favour, 1 abstention)

That following consideration of the relevant development plan policies, planning permission be refused.

15b For the retention of a temporary store for liquid organic waste at Land to the north of Kirton Road, Blyton - D. R. Jacques & Son (Agent: Robert Farrow (Design) Ltd) - 139472

(NOTE: Councillor S P Roe re-joined the meeting)

The Committee received a report which sought retrospective planning permission for the retention of a temporary store for liquid organic waste at land to the north of Kirton Road, Blyton.

Officers guided members through the report and set out the main issues to be considered in the determination of this application.

Councillor I G Fleetwood advised that he was the Chairman of the Planning Committee at West Lindsey District Council, and he had not discussed this application at the district council.

It was reported that further to the publication of the agenda, clarification had been received regarding the cover of the tank which was set out in the update which had been circulated to the Committee the previous Friday.

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
29 JULY 2019

It was highlighted that it was important that the effect of any light pollution was taken into account. Members were advised that condition 5 detailed that any lighting needed to be approved before being brought onto the site.

On a motion by Councillor D McNally, and seconded by Councillor P A Skinner it was:-

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That conditional temporary planning permission be granted.

16 COUNTY COUNCIL APPLICATIONS

16a To construct Section 5 of the Spalding Western Relief Road comprising of a new single carriageway route from the B1356 Spalding Road and Enterprise Way to Vernatt's Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) incorporating a new roundabout junction with the B1356 Spalding Road, a bridge over the Peterborough to Sleaford railway line, and a priority junction into Vernatt's SUE - H14-0326-19

To construct Section 1 of the Spalding Western Relief Road comprising of a new single carriageway route from the B1172 Spalding Common to Holland Park Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) incorporating a new roundabout junction with the B1172 Spalding Common, a bridge over the Peterborough to Sleaford railway line, and a new roundabout junction for access into Holland Park SUE - H16-0327-19

The Committee received a report which sought planning permission for Section 1 (the southern section) and Section 5 (the northern section) of the Spalding Western Relief Road.

The Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR) was an important highway infrastructure project for the Spalding area. The SWRR sought to relieve congestion in Spalding caused by frequent closures of the highway network at level crossing and the facilitate access for and within the Vernatt's Sustainable Urban Extension (VSUE) and the Holland Park Sustainable Urban Extension (HPSUE). It was planned to build the SWRR in three phases, Section 1 (the southern section) and Section 5 (the northern section) were to be built first with Sections 2, 3 and 4 (collectively referred to as the central section) to be built at a later date as the development of the VSUE and HPSUE progressed.

It was reported that since the publication of the agenda, further representations had been received, details of which were set out in the update which had been circulated to the Committee the previous Friday.

Officers guided the Committee through the report and set out the background and details of each application including the route, funding and timescales and details of

the environmental assessment, transport assessment and results of consultation and publicity.

Simon Holmes, representing SPARR (Spalding Pinchbeck Against the Relief Road), spoke as an objector and made the following points:

- This application contravened PPG14 (Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) 2014 Delivering sustainable development in accordance with a wide variety of the guidance⁴ categories, these including; climate change, design, vitality, flood risk, health and wellbeing, housing and economic development needs and land availability assessments, local plans, natural environments, noise open space, planning obligations, travel plans, viability, the use of conditions and water quality) and was also commented that it defied logic and common sense.
- In terms of location, the current design was inappropriate. The road veered towards a waterway, and built on designated green space and impinged key eco-systems.
- The location of Junction B maximised vehicle movement in a sustainable development, ROM figures suggested 2 million nugatory miles per year (based on 2250 properties, 1 car per household, mean distance to Junction B 1 mile, 5 return journeys per week, 48 weeks per year gives a total of 2,160,000 miles a year) with the environmental, health and financial implications to match.
- It was noted the central section had returned to consultation; the favoured (by an unscientific show of hands at the public meeting) marked corridor was compromised by the location of Junction B and limited future viable options. Pushing ahead piecemeal would result in a sub-optimal network. It would not escape the committee's attention, the unconventional road layout required to join the network.
- It failed to take into account the Environmental Impact Assessment destroying the water voles' environment, a protected species, and the construction area adjacent further compounded this.
- Residents had been informed that key elements would adhere to industry best practice (best practice for one situation did not make it best practice for another) a term competent engineers stopped using years ago; with no public scrutiny what competent 'independent body' was going to assure compliance? The committee were invited to reject this incomplete application as due diligence could not be completed.
- During public consultation (Woodlands Hotel, 16 February 2019) mitigation to the severe impact of Junction B (250m embankment running south of Junction B along South Drove), was outlined, a position reinforced at a SHDC meeting. These measures were not reflected in the planning application and should be placed as a condition.
- In summary, a sub-optimal plan, with severe negative environmental impacts, limiting future options, and would result in inflated cost to the public purse, changing designs in the planning phase was exponentially cheaper than when under construction. The Committee was therefore invited to defer or reject this application, until the route of the section was known, as it failed to meet the terms of PPG 14;

There were no questions to the objector.

James Avery, representing Pinchbeck Parish Council, spoke as an objector and made the following points:

- He clarified that he was speaking on behalf of Pinchbeck Parish Council and as the district councillor for the residents of Pinchbeck and Surfleet. He was not representing South Holland District Council.
- Within the report presented there was a golden thread hinting at the benefits of the Spalding Western Relief Road. Given section 5 was a cul-de-sac, such terminology was wholly misleading and disingenuous given there was currently no funding or commitment to the timeframe for sections 2 to 4, and therefore, provided no relief to the existing road network and its users.
- Plans for Phase 1 and 2 of the Vernatts SUE included 1000 houses, bringing about significant, additional vehicle movements which could only travel north.
- The initial 1000 houses would take time to build, but traffic levels would intensify over time, and road users would find the path of least resistance, and head through pinchbeck.
- The transport assessment suggested that, in isolation, section 5 of the relief road would bring about transport improvements, and would improve transport links and capacity on the surrounding network.
- At SHDC Planning Committee, the LCC Highways Consultant indicated the new roundabout at Enterprise Way would ease the traffic flow. There was, however, no evidence presented as to how this would come about.
- At the same meeting the Consultant was also asked "how Highways would mitigate the impact of significantly increasing traffic movements within Pinchbeck", but they declined to respond.
- Section 5 was a key. It would enable developers to unlock their land for housing. Unfortunately, once developers had access to the land they had control, and as a district councillor, and member of SHDC Planning Committee, he had seen countless times the cynicism displayed by some developers.
- The Lincoln Bypass and Grantham Southern Relief Road projects were both fully forward funded, with retrospective funding from developer contributions. Both £100m+ projects.
- A completed Spalding Western Relief Road was of a similar scale to those projects, and it was not understood why LCC were unwilling to fully forward fund a fully joined up Relief Road for Spalding. Evidence showed that the relief Road was critical to the delivery of Spalding's growth strategy, and for this reason, the design and funding for the entire route should be identified and secured at this stage.

There were no questions to the objector.

Ian Turvey, agent for the applicant spoke in favour of the application and made the following points:-

- Section 1 and Section 5 of the Spalding Western Relief Road both formed key component parts of a strategic road scheme which was of high priority within

the Highway Authority's Capital Programme and were both fully supported by the current Local Transport Plan (LTP).

- There was a commitment to funding and it was intended to construct Section 5 by 2021 and Section 1 by the following year.
- Direct consultation with statutory bodies including Network Rail, Historic England, Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Welland and Deepings Internal Drainage Board had raised no objection to the proposals.
- The LTP was published in 2013, and dealt with concerns for the future economy of Spalding town centre if Network Rail implemented plans to increase freight traffic through the town. But there were also wider implications. In 2014, following further rigorous analysis, a Transport Strategy for Spalding (up to 2036) was adopted by this authority and also by South Holland District Council.
- It was realised that an effective transport strategy would ensure that the travel and transport impact of growth around the town could be achieved, but that priorities needed to be identified so that funding could be obtained, from local and national sources when it became available.
- Extensive consultation was undertaken in 2014 prior to the publication of the Strategy, drawing on the various plans and initiatives that had come forward through the planning process in the previous 10 years or so, and the outcomes had been scrutinised by governance boards within the authorities.
- The desired outcome of the Strategy, amongst a wide raft of social, environmental and economic goals, were to reduce the amount of traffic entering the town and to make the roads safer and with the benefit of providing resilience along the A16 corridor to the east of the town.
- These objectives and outcomes had to meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and also the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan – that was itself adopted on 8 March 2019 with recommendation by an Independent Inspector following an extensive Examination in Public.
- The Spalding Western Relief Road was identified as the most important proposed strategic infrastructure project for the local area - and what you see before you today was the product of several years of extensive consultation, assessment, policy development and planning – and all within the context of a commitment by the Highway Authority to deliver a priority scheme.
- Sister documents supported the Strategy, which dealt with movement and deliverability, programming and assurance – the technical appraisal of the preferred schemes – the alignments, junction configuration etc. had evolved.
- In 2017, the Strategy supported a funding bid, and the successful outcome was an award of £12m towards the proposed improvements at and adjacent to Spalding Road/Pinchbeck Road.
- The bid set out the intended strategic road corridor along with the scheme objectives and was fully supported by the then Minister of State for Transport and the local Member of Parliament for South Holland and the Deepings.
- That successful award allowed the priority for the Relief Road deliverability to be re-assessed and for the Highways Authority to accelerate its preferred programme of phased delivery of the road in sections.

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
29 JULY 2019

- Instead of one section being able to be developed now, the award of a government contribution had allowed a second section to be planned at the same time.
- There was a danger therefore, if the planning permission for section 5 was not granted, as not only would that be at odds with local adopted policy, but it would also result in the loss of significant funding that would likely not be available in the future.
- The summary papers before the Committee set out the detail of the two planning applications for Section 1 and Section 5 and in turn these referenced the library of documentation that had informed the development of the proposed preferred schemes – including a full Environmental Statement.
- South Holland District Council had been formally consulted on these proposals in its role as Local Planning Authority – and had endorsed both schemes at their Planning Committee in May 2019.
- For Section 1, by promoting a strategic road corridor, the Highway Authority could ensure that road infrastructure would be delivered in a manner that was consistent across all sections of the relief Road and which conformed to the local and national design specifications of a principal road.
- For Section 5, the route incorporated a new 5-arm roundabout junction with Spalding Road and Enterprise Way – road geometry, capacity, and Network Rail requirements had been key considerations in a wide range of alternatives that had been considered, north along Spalding Road.
- A detailed landscape strategy had formed a key part of the design process and members would note that computer visualisations and separate photo-montage techniques had been used to inform the preliminary design and the visual assessment, so that the visual impact of the bridge from downstairs facades of the closest properties – between 85m and 225m from the new road – would be minimised.
- All of the proposed planning conditions were acceptable.
- It was respectfully suggested that members supported the officer recommendation for approval for both of the planning application.

Members were provided with the opportunity to ask questions to the applicant and the following was noted:

- It was queried whether the route for Section 2 was close to being announced. Members were reminded that the applications before them were for Sections 1 and 5.
- In response to a question, officers clarified that in terms of the alternate route for Section 2, the local plan showed that the land had been allocated to housing and a school.

Comments were received by e-mail from Councillor Mrs E J Sneath, the local member for Spalding Elloe as follows:

- She urged the Committee to reject the proposed planning application H14-0326-19 section 5 of the Spalding Western Relief Road.
- The application for the Pinchbeck end of this so called 'relief road' was nothing more than a developer led, ill-considered folly that would blight the lives of the residents of all the villages on this main arterial road leading in to Spalding.

- The effects of this increase of traffic into our market town, our cottage hospital, our primary and senior schools and our shops and businesses would be catastrophic.
- The proposed road was nothing more than a giant cul-de-sac for 1000 houses, potentially 2000 extra traffic movements a day, the misery this volume of traffic would bring was immense.
- Members would hear a lot of rhetoric about the need for a relief road but that is not what this is about, it was being pushed through because funding was being promised but sometimes money was just too expensive and this was certainly the case with this application.
- On behalf of all the residents of Pinchbeck and Spalding Elloe whom she represented, Councillor Sneath requested that the Committee turn down this application.

Members were provided with the opportunity to discuss the applications as presented and some of the points raised included the following:

- A member expressed concerns that the design of Section 1 now swung away from the development and more towards the Drain. This design now differed from what was passed in 2009, and was pushing it nearer to houses on South Drove. The previous route of the road from 2009 was therefore preferred.
- The Committee was thanked for visiting Two Plank Bridge.
- The report mentioned that there would be noise during construction, and it was requested that some noise attenuation measures were included as there was a need to take into account the impact on the residents who currently lived there. Members were advised that a planning condition required the submission and approval of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan which would provide further details of measures to be adopted to be adopted to minimise noise during the construction phase.
- It was highlighted that it was common when dealing with major projects, such as the Lincoln Eastern Bypass, that not all sections were agreed at the start of the project. There was a need to make a start somewhere.
- The funding and timeframe for delivery was referenced in the report.
- It was important to keep in context what was being discussed as the County Council Planning Committee. The housing allocation had already been agreed as part of the Local Plan, and members were here to determine the application for the road. It was acknowledged that it was not a complete road, but there was a need to start somewhere. The benefits of this application going over the railway line were noted, and it was commented that it was pleasing to see that the design had been future proofed by allowing enough clearance for electrification. The main issue was to get the road over the railway line.
- There were some concerns about the location of the roundabout.
- The Committee could not speculate on what might come in future.
- Councillor Mrs A M Newton was thanked for her assistance and local knowledge on the site visit.
- There was sympathy for Mr Avery and his concerns regarding developers, but the Committee needed to make a decision on material planning considerations.

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE

29 JULY 2019

- It was noted that housing had been allocated on the local plan, but it was queried whether planning permission had been granted for the housing. Members were advised that there was permission for the Holland Park SUE, at Section 1.
- One member commented that they were reasonably happy with the proposal for Section 1, as the developer had been building there for some time, and it would be beneficial if that road could be put in place and joined up with Spalding Common. There were slight concerns with the location of the roundabout and would prefer it to be in the same location as put forward in 2009.
- Regarding an alternate route for Section 2, officers confirmed that the Committee had to consider only the applications and sections that were in front of them and as such not the central section. Options for the preferred route of the central section had yet to be finalised but officers highlighted that the land of the previous "allotment route" was now allocated for housing and a school site in the recently adopted Local Plan.

On a motion by Councillor T R Ashton and seconded by Councillor L A Cawrey, it was:

RESOLVED (9 in favour)

That planning permission be granted in relation to Section 1 of the Spalding Western Relief Road.

RESOLVED (8 in favour, 1 against)

That planning permission be granted in relation to Section 5 of the Spalding Western Relief Road.

The meeting closed at 12.51 pm