

**PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
5 JULY 2021**

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR I G FLEETWOOD (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors T R Ashton (Vice-Chairman), P Ashleigh-Morris, Mrs A M Austin, S A J Blackburn, I D Carrington, A M Hall, C S Macey, Mrs A M Newton MBE, Mrs M J Overton MBE, N H Pepper, R P H Reid and N Sear.

Councillor: A P Maughan attended the meeting as an observer.

Officers in attendance:-

Neil McBride (Head of Planning), Jeanne Gibson (Programme Leader: Minor Works and Traffic), Nick Harrison (Democratic Services Officer), Marc Willis (Applications Manager) and Jamie Parsons (Solicitor)

1 APOLOGIES/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS

An apology for absence had been received from Councillor P Skinner.

2 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

None received.

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE HELD ON 15 MARCH 2021

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 March 2021, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4 TRAFFIC ITEMS

5 A153 GREYLEES - PROPOSED 30MPH SPEED LIMIT

The Committee considered a report in connection with an objection received to the proposed introduction of a 30mph speed limit on the A153 at Greylees. Having assessed the section of the A153 as shown at Appendix A of the report, a speed limit was found to be justified against the criteria set out in the speed limit policy. Mean traffic speed was recorded at 35mph, and therefore it could be considered a borderline case for the

2

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE

5 JULY 2021

introduction of a 30mph limit. A report was subsequently brought to the Committee last February where approval to pursue the limit was supported.

On a motion by Councillor I G Fleetwood, seconded by Councillor N H Pepper, it was:

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the objection be overruled so that the public advertisement of the proposal, as shown at Appendix B of the report, could be carried out.

6 TATTERSHALL THORPE B1192 - PROPOSED SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION

The Committee considered a report on a request for a reduction in speed limit on the B1192 Northbound through the village. Investigations indicated that two potential speed limit reductions may be considered as borderline cases as defined in the speed limit policy.

On a motion by Councillor T R Ashton, seconded by I G Fleetwood, it was:

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the reduction in speed limit proposed be approved so that the necessary consultation process to bring it into effect may be pursued.

7 DODDINGTON MAIN STREET B1190 - PROPOSED PUFFIN CROSSING FACILITY

The Committee considered a report on the outcome of a pedestrian crossing survey carried out following a request for one in the vicinity of Doddington Hall, as show at Appendix B of the report.

On a motion by Councillor I G Fleetwood, seconded by Councillor A M Newton MBE, it was:

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the submission of a funding bid for a feasibility study, design and installation of a Puffin crossing in the vicinity of Doddington Hall be approved.

8 BARDNEY SILVER STREET - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

The Chairman reported that this matter would be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee scheduled for 26 July 2021 in order for the report to be updated with the latest information.

9 LONG BENNINGTON MAIN ROAD - PROPOSED MANDATORY CYCLE LANES,
ADVISORY CYCLE LANES AND WAITING RESTRICTIONS

The Committee considered a report on objections received to a proposal to introduce mandatory and advisory cycle lanes and waiting restrictions along Main Road, Long Bennington as show in Appendix B of the report.

Eight objections had been received to the scheme during its advertisement period and these were outlined in the report together with the response to them.

In summary the report outlined that the proposed mandatory cycle lane would operate at all times with no loading or waiting allowed within it and the advisory cycle lane would be free of all parked vehicles from Monday to Friday between 8am to 5pm and free from HGV parking at all times. The scheme served to provide a dedicated cycle facility linking existing cycle routes and also aimed to reduce the impact of overnight HGV parking in this area of the village.

Councillor A Maughan, attended the meeting via Teams and made the following comments:-

- The details of the scheme had been developed in close consultation with the parish council and playing field management committee, with an on-site meeting held to agree the details, before going out to public consultation.
- The single yellow line proposed outside the sports facilities ensured that evening and weekend parking for visitors to our local sport facilities would still be possible. For daytime users of the facilities, parking would be possible south of Westborough Lane. There was also a possibility of limited off-street parking for the playing field in the future.
- As well as improving cycle links between Long Bennington and neighbouring villages of Claypole and Dry Doddington and Newark town centre, the scheme also had the added bonus of removing dangerous overnight lorry parking from the north end of the village. The area had suffered for well over decade with the impact of 20+ lorries every night of the week using the village as a stop-over. With no facilities in place this has led to high levels of litter and human waste being left on village verges.
- The cycle scheme would ensure cyclists could pass safely along this part of the village to join the A1 cycle path. It would also put an end to the unacceptable overnight lorry parking.
- There had been concerns in the village that the scheme could displace HGVs further into the village, into the residential areas. He had been reassured by Highways Officers that if this were the case HGVs would be in breach of their permits and therefore this was unlikely. Highways would monitor the impact of the scheme, and in the unlikely event this became a problem the County Council would consider additional measures.

(Councillor M J Overton MBE joined the meeting at this point)

(On a motion by Councillor I G Fleetwood, seconded by Councillor R P H Reid, it was:

RESOLVED (13 for, 1 abstention)

That the objections be overruled and the proposal as advertised be approved.

10 COUNTY MATTER APPLICATIONS

11 TO EXTRACT AND PROCESS SAND AND GRAVEL AND TO PROGRESSIVELY RESTORE THE SITE TO A MIXTURE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND, NATURE CONSERVATION AREA AND AN AGRICULTURAL WATER RESERVOIR AT LAND AT KING STREET, GREATFORD - DR CHARLES DANIEL LANE - S20/1351

The Committee considered a report where Planning permission was sought by Dr Charles Daniel Lane (the Applicant) to extract and process sand and gravel and to progressively restore the site to a mixture of agricultural land, nature conservation area and an agricultural water reservoir at Land at King Street, Greatford, Lincolnshire in the parish of Greatford. The proposed development would constitute the creation of a new sand and gravel quarry with a restoration strategy to create three separate but linked after-uses, being low level agriculture, an irrigation lagoon and wetland habitat. The proposal was subject of an Environmental Impact Assessment submitted pursuant to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and a Planning and Environmental Statement (PES) had been submitted which assessed the potential impacts of the proposed development together with the mitigation measures proposed to avoid, reduce and, if possible remedy any significant adverse impacts.

The Head of Planning guided members through the report and set out the main issues to be considered in the determination of the application.

The report recommended that following consideration of the relevant development plan policies and the comments received through consultation and publicity conditional planning permission be granted subject to the applicant completing a section 106 Planning Obligation.

The Agent, Simon Tucker, Quartet/Ashton Estate, on behalf of the applicant, attended via Teams and spoke in support of the application and made the following statement:- "I am director of DTA, a traffic and transport planning consultant acting on behalf of the applicant. The report recommendations are supported. One of the significant merits of the Manor Farm site was that it was largely unexceptional. There were few, if any interesting features on this isolated parcel of land, being circa 55 hectares, flat, well drained, remote from the nearest residence (at least 420m), the nearest village of Baston (at least 440m) and remote from any distinguishing heritage features. All the relevant potential impacts of a proposed gravel quarry had been explored in detail in the application and supporting EIA. These included a detailed report for all likely impacts including noise, dust, air quality, heritage features and hydrology. The overall conclusion of the report was that the scheme was wholly acceptable and policy compliant subject to the usual planning conditions. The transport aspects of the site merited some more detailed comments. The scheme had been

subject to a detailed Transport Assessment which had been scoped and agreed with the Highway Authority. Discussions had taken place about potential mitigation. The site bordered the straight road of King Street. In statistical terms, the circa one kilometre of straight road south of the quarry access was safe and appropriate to serve the development. The site went through a formal Mineral Plan adoption process and was found to be acceptable. However, as part of the application, a scheme of mitigation had been agreed, in principle, with the Council. This comprised:

- (a) A routing agreement, secured by a S106 agreement, which would prevent movements through nearby villages.
- (b) A carefully designed T-junction access to the quarry, which would direct all HGVs from the site to route south, hence avoiding the junction of King Street and the A15.
- (c) The widening of one kilometre of King Street to the minimum width recommended by LCC Highways (5.5m).

In addition to meeting the critical land supply needed for minerals set out in the Plan, it would also allow, in the restoration plan, the creation of an irrigation reservoir. This would have a dramatic benefit in terms of crop diversification for the farmer of up to 400 acres of the nearby farm".

Vanessa Smith attended the meeting via Teams and spoke in objection to the application and made the following statement:- "The morning after I found about this meeting I woke up in a cold sweat. I had dreamt that I had just found a motorcyclist dead in the ditch opposite my house. He had skidded on mud on the road. I have lived on the King Street / Stowe roads crossroads for the past six years. My house is around half a mile south of the proposed quarry exit and a well-known accident hotspot. Prior to lockdown there was a road traffic accident directly outside my house on average every three to four months, normally with emergency services present. For whatever reason accidents are not always officially recorded and as such the transport statement attached to this application was woefully incomplete. I can stand in my upstairs bedroom and watch traffic straddle King Street travelling at speeds in excess of 90mphs. I watch traffic skim past each other and hear the hoot of horns on a daily basis. I would like to know why increasing the road width by just 20cm to accommodate up to 100 extra HGVs per day is sufficient. King Street at the West Deeping quarry had to be widened to over 6m for this purpose and this has also been the case for the quarry at Baston. Why is 5.5m for this quarry sufficient? Indeed, given that plans now propose all site traffic enter and exit the site from the south lorries will frequently pass each other and as such a minimum of 6.8m is recommended by the government's own highway guidelines. I quote: "This minimum width shall be... ..6.8 metres for roads where buses or heavy goods vehicles are likely to pass each other on a regular basis. Besides the transport statement containing incomplete accident data the traffic survey was also conducted during the week of Easter Bank Holiday Monday such that traffic levels would be unlikely to be typical. There have been well over 100 objections raised by local residents. The main concern is road safety. King Street was already a death trap and allowing the current plans to pass was surely negligent. Increasing road width would help but I do not think that it alone would reduce serious accidents. The transport statement found up to 13 cars a day travelling in excess of 90mph. Enforcing a reduced speed limit was therefore also essential. When the next person died on King Street questions would be asked as to whether quarry traffic contributed. If these plans pass, in their current form, the people that

permitted this would surely face serious questioning. For the record I do not mind living close to a quarry, indeed the excavation site at West Deeping was closer to my house. However, I do mind finding dead people and emergency services in my front garden".

The Chair of Greatford Parish Council, Philip Britton attended the meeting via Teams and spoke in objection to the application and made the following statement:-

'The primary objection to the development of the proposed quarry was the effect of the increase in HGV traffic upon the road safety of King Street, and the surrounding villages including Greatford. The transport statement showed 16,329 vehicles per week used the road with speeds up to 68.5 mph and an average speed of 57mph, King Street was a fast road and had a collision rate higher than the national average. There had been 23 collisions in the last 5 years including severe and fatal collisions. The applicants transport statement was incomplete as it had no assessment of likely impact at the main junction of King St and the A1175 even though this was the proposed route to and from the proposed quarry. This junction had a history of at least six reported collisions in the last 5 years. Also the applicants transport statement showed no collisions occurred at the Stowe Road junction, yet LCCs own data showed five collisions here, including recent fatal collisions. King Street was for a significant proportion of its length less than 5.5m wide, most HGV's were over 3m wide when their mirrors were included, this meant that 2 HGV's could not pass on some parts of King Street unless they slowed down and mounted the verge to avoid collision. LCCs own website stated that for road design advice refers to the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges when speed limits were over 40mph. The manual stated that a road should be 7.3m wide. LCC required King Street to be widened to 7.3m from the junction with the A1175 up to the existing quarry site entrance, and the applicants proposed site entrance was also 7.3m wide, why was LCC suggesting a road width of 5.5m was wide enough for the proposed quarry, when their own published guidance, planning precedence and common sense demonstrate that it was not? The suggested routing strategy for the proposed quarry was flawed and would not be sufficient to prevent quarry traffic using the side roads off King Street. The existing routing agreements for other quarries in the area succeed only in routing the quarry operators own vehicles via the proscribed route, they did not stop other hauliers working out of these quarries from using Greatford as a short cut, we never see Hanson or Cemex (the quarry operators) lorries in the village, but we do see many other operators vehicles, in an 18 day period from mid-February to early March 2020 we observed 14 different hauliers operating tipper trucks through the village. The T-junction with Main Street and Carlby road in Greatford was narrow and HGV's regularly mounted the pavement when encountering other traffic at this junction creating significant danger for pedestrians. The environmental impact from vibration, noise and diesel fumes should not be underestimated. Greatford urgently needed a weight limit to protect the village and its residents from the hazards created by HGV's using the village as a rat run. The proposed quarry and the traffic it will generate increases this need and we urge you to carefully consider the overall impact on the area and reject this application'.

The Head of Planning reported that the width of road improvements were consistent with Council policy and the widths proposed in the report could be because of some constraints on the roadside/verges.

Whilst there was general support for the planning application there were a number of concerns about the proposed width of the road which was thought to be too narrow and possibly not in line with Council guidelines. There was a general preference for the road width to be at least 6m minimum if possible. Reference was made to the possible impact on verges should two quarry lorries need to pass each other. There was also some disappointment expressed that the County Council did not have weight limit restrictions policy.

It was reported that King Street was a long stretch of road on which excessive speeds had been recorded. However, it was confirmed by Officers that it was not possible to use the planning application to resolve existing and historical traffic issues like speeding. It was also not possible to control routing agreements by planning conditions. It was reported that the Council was reliant on the public to report incidents and if there was sufficient evidence an injunction order could be considered.

The Committee thought that more consideration could be given to whether it was possible to widen the road and that this should be discussed with Officers from Traffic and Highways Department who were not in attendance at the meeting. A site visit was proposed for Committee members to be able to consider this matter further.

The Head of Planning suggested that the application could be deferred for further analysis of road widths to be undertaken. The impact of arranging a site visit whilst Covid-19 restrictions were in place could mean a delay and the possibility that the application may not be able to be considered at the next meeting on 26 July but may have to be deferred until the September meeting.

On a motion by Councillor N H Pepper, seconded by Councillor I G Fleetwood, it was:-

RESOLVED (Unanimous)

That the planning application be deferred pending a Committee site visit (to be arranged after the 19 July) in the presence of a Highways Officer, to view the carriage verges to determine if the road could be widened.

11a To construct a Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) school with associated external spaces works, parking and vehicular and pedestrian accesses at Former Usher Junior School site, Skellingthorpe Road, Lincoln - 2021/0375/CCC

The Committee considered a report where Planning permission was sought to construct a Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) school with associated external spaces works, parking and vehicular and pedestrian accesses at the Former Usher Junior School site, Skellingthorpe Road, Lincoln. The development was one of two proposals that were associated with the existing Lincoln St. Christopher's SEND school on Hykeham Road.

Lincoln St Christopher's School had experienced significant growth over the last few years and the demand for school places regularly exceeded place availability. Projected demand for special school places in the Lincoln City area indicated the need for an additional 111

places to be made available by 2023 and in order to meet this need it was proposed to expand the capacity of the school through the formation of a split school site. To achieve this it was proposed to construct a new school for primary school aged children and then redevelop the existing Lincoln St. Christopher's site. The proposal related to the development of a new modern, purpose built SEND school on the former Usher Junior School site. The school would provide places for a total of 130 students (aged 3 to 11) with a range of different needs including profound and multiple learning difficulties (PMLD), severe or moderate learning difficulties (SLD/MLD) and those with autistic-spectrum disorder (ASD). The school was anticipated to employ 68 staff comprising of 52 full-time equivalent staff and 16 staff who would work across both this school and the existing Lincoln St. Christopher's School site. Both staff and pupils currently attending the existing Lincoln St. Christopher's School would be relocated to this site should permission be granted.

The report recommended that following consideration of the relevant development plan policies and the comments received through consultation and publicity conditional planning be granted.

Officers guided members through the report and set out the main issues to be considered in the determination of the application. The planning update circulated to the Committee on 2 July recommended that condition 7 be amended to read as follows: *No construction traffic, other than that required to carry out the improvement works to the eastern vehicular access, shall enter the site until the eastern vehicular access has been temporarily upgraded in accordance with a specification agreed by the Highway Authority and is available for use.*

Kyna Adkins, Headteacher, Lincoln St. Christopher's SEND school attended the meeting via Teams to support the application. She commented on the large demand for school places, the problems with the current buildings and space and the intention to open up the new facilities to the wider community when not in use by the school. She also explained, following questions from members, how the pupils mostly travelled to the school on arranged transport rather than being dropped off by their parents and how this was different to other schools. It was confirmed that there was a travel plan for staff parking and pick-ups and drop offs.

Some members expressed concern about possibility of increased parking problems in the area arising from the development. Officers reported that they were satisfied that a suitable parking and travel plan were in place and the transport arrangements to this school were indeed different to other schools which had all the associated problems on children being drive to and collected from school.

Councillor Mrs A M Newton MBE, asked for it to be recorded that she had a similar experience of a previous application for an extension from a nursery school attached to the primary school in 2019, where assurances from Officers had been given about the supply of sufficient parking. However, there had been subsequent complaints about parking following the development. Several residents had raised issues relating to inconsiderate parking, often staff parking partially overhanging driveways all day. She expressed concern that parking should be considered at the time of the planning applications and that councillor's

correspondence with residents included many complaints about road traffic issues associated with taking and collecting children to and from school, especially parking on private property.

On a motion by Councillor T R Ashton, seconded by Councillor I G Fleetwood, it was:-

RESOLVED (12 for and 2 abstentions (Councillors Mrs A M Newton MBE and Mrs Ashleigh-Morris))

That conditional planning permission be approved, as amended by revised Condition 7, as outlined above and in the Planning Update.

12 FOR THE DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING BUILDING, THE SPORTS HALL, AND MOBILE CLASSROOMS OF THE EXISTING SCHOOL AND TO CONSTRUCT A NEW BLOCK COMPRISING; EIGHT NEW CLASSROOMS, SPORTS HALL, FOOD TECH, OFFICE, ADMIN AND STAFF SPACES AT ST CHRISTOPHERS SCHOOL, HYKEHAM ROAD, LINCOLN - 2021/0379/CCC

The Committee considered a report where Planning permission was sought for the demolition of an existing building, the sports hall, and mobile classrooms of the existing school and to construct a new block comprising; eight new classrooms, sports hall, food tech, office, admin and staff spaces at St Christopher's School, Hykeham Road, Lincoln. The development was one of two proposals that were associated with the existing Lincoln St Christopher's SEND school on Hykeham Road. Lincoln St Christopher's School had experienced significant growth over the last few years and the demand for school places regularly exceeded place availability. Projected demand for special school places in the Lincoln City area indicated the need for an additional 111 places to be made available by 2023 and in order to meet the need it was proposed to expand the capacity of the school through the formation of a split school site. To achieve this it was proposed to construct a new school for primary school aged children and then redevelop the existing Lincoln St Christopher's site. The report related to a proposal to redevelop and refurbish the existing Lincoln St Christopher's School in order to modernise the facilities available and increase the number of pupil places it could currently offer to Secondary school aged children. The main issues to be taken into consideration were the location of the development and acceptability of this development given the sites allocation in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan as well as a consideration of the potential environmental and amenity impacts of the development.

The report recommended that following consideration of the relevant development plan policies and the comments received through consultation and publicity conditional planning be granted.

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

10

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE

5 JULY 2021

(Councillor Mrs A M Newton MBE gave her apologies and left the meeting at this point. She had previously notified that Chairman that she would have to leave the meeting at 12.30pm for another important appointment)

On a motion by Councillor I G Fleetwood, seconded by Councillor T R Ashton, it was:-

RESOLVED (Unanimous)

That conditional planning permission be approved.

The meeting closed at 12.40 pm