



**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
2 OCTOBER 2017**

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR I G FLEETWOOD (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors D Brailsford, 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 and C L Strange

Councillors: attended the meeting as observers

Officers in attendance:-

Steve Blagg (Democratic Services Officer), Jeanne Gibson (Area Highways Manager (City of Lincoln)), Neil McBride (Planning Manager), Marc Willis (Applications Team Leader) and Mandy Wood (Solicitor)

24 APOLOGIES/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors T R Ashton, S R Kirk, R P H Reid and M J Storer.

The Chief Executive reported that under the Local Government (Committee and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, he had appointed Councillor C L Strange to the Committee, place of Councillor L A Cawrey, for this meeting only.

25 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

None were declared at this stage of the meeting.

**26 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND
REGULATION COMMITTEE HELD ON 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 4 September 2017, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to Councillor H Spratt's name being added to the list of apologies.

27 TRAFFIC ITEMS

**28 LINCOLN TRANSPORT HUB VARIOUS LOCATIONS - PROPOSED
PERMANENT TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS**

The Committee received a report in connection with objections received to proposed traffic regulation orders to alter waiting and loading restrictions at various City Centre

2

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE

2 OCTOBER 2017

locations in support of infrastructure changes brought about by the construction of Lincoln's new Transport Hub.

The report detailed the existing conditions, the proposals, consultation, objections received and the comments of officers on the objections received.

On a motion by Councillor I G Fleetwood, seconded by Councillor P A Skinner, it was –

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the objections be overruled and the Orders be confirmed as proposed at consultation.

29 TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS – PROGRESS REVIEW

The Committee received a report in connection with the latest position of all current Traffic Regulation Orders and petitions received since the last time they were presented to the Committee.

RESOLVED

That the Traffic Regulation Orders and petitions received be noted.

30 COUNTY MATTER APPLICATION

31 TO CHANGE OF USE FROM AGRI-BASED ANAEROBIC DIGESTION FACILITY TO COMMERCIAL ANAEROBIC DIGESTION FACILITY - HOLDINGHAM BIOGAS, HOLDINGHAM, SLEAFORD - FKB LIMITED (AGENT: THE GREENSPAN AGENCY) - N57/0833/17

Stephen Flanagan, an objector, commented as follows:-

- Permission to build the plant was originally given by North Kesteven District Council (NKDC) and had been a contentious decision.
- NKDC stated it was unlikely that they would have supported any proposal for a commercial waste anaerobic digester plant had it been submitted in that format at the outset.
- Please do not treat this as a switch of use to a commercial concern. At a NKDC Planning meeting it was suggested that the applicant would eventually switch to waste products but this had been denied.
- Reference was made to an application the applicant had submitted at Nocton Fen which had been refused by NKDC because of the materials the applicant was proposing to use. The applicant had ignored the planning conditions and had built differently to what had been approved.
- Reference was made to numerous planning applications that had been refused due to concerns about odour from waste products. Stated that

objections from MPs and Councillors to close down some anaerobic digester sites because of odour.

- A lot of sites had gained initial approval on restricted crop inputs and had subsequently switched to the use of waste products to the regret of local residents.
- This site had been built too near residential properties with 200 new homes proposed only 350 meters away.

No questions were asked of the objector.

Robert Beck, the applicant, commented as follows:-

- The operation of the plant and its history was explained.
- Clean energy was produced for the generation of electricity.
- Feedstock could not be burnt.
- The plant had operated for two years and no complaints had been received about odour.
- The plant would benefit from a greater range of feedstocks.
- The plant was located near to farms producing poultry litter and this could be transported to the plant on the local highway network.
- The Government wished to encourage the development of these sites.
- The plant supported local employment.
- Renewable energy was green and economical.
- The Environment Agency's waste licence would ensure that the site was properly controlled.

Questions by the Committee to Robert Beck and his responses, included:-

- Similar anaerobic digesters had experienced major issues with odour. Had you been involved in any of these plants? Robert Beck assumed the question was in connection with the Nocton plant but this had been nothing to do with odour and people were unaware of the facts.
- Had the applicant any issues with odour from other plants? Robert Beck stated that he did not have any issues with odour.
- Different crops were needed for an anaerobic digester. What transport arrangements were in place? Robert Beck explained the transport arrangements adding that there was no traffic impact. Syrup would be pumped directly into the digester and poultry litter would be fed in to it on a daily basis.
- Anaerobic digesters needed to be well managed by using a combination of crops. Robert Beck stated that odour indicated inefficiency. He stated that waste, including crops left in the open, lost 30% of their energy and especially if allowed to warm up. Since the plant had been in operation there had not been any complaints about odour.
- Leaching was an issue with the storage of poultry litter. Robert Beck stated that if it was necessary to store the poultry litter in exceptional circumstances then it would be stored on a sealed surface. Other than the existing consented silage, there were no proposals to store either liquid or solid wastes on site and so no new infrastructure or storage areas were required.

**PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
2 OCTOBER 2017**

- Had Robert Beck suitable arrangements with farmers for the collection of waste? Robert Beck stated that the logistics for the collection of waste were good.
- Robert Beck stated in response to two questions that he liked to use heat from the plant for drying and that any excess waste was sent to the Sleaford Power Plant. He stated that the application would free up 2000 acres of agricultural land for production and poultry litter waste could be used as fertilizer.

Responses by officers to comments by the Committee, included:-

- Poultry litter was not classed as food waste.
- The proposed conditions for this application were largely the same as the original planning decision approved by NKDC.
- The prevailing wind for the application site meant that on most occasions the odour would be blown away from the proposed new housing site.
- Officers did not have any evidence about similar plants operating in the country and that the Committee should only examine the application before it today.

A member commented that if a similar application had been submitted today it would not receive planning permission because of the proposed new housing development in the vicinity of the site.

On a motion by Councillor D McNally, seconded by Councillor D Brailsford, it was –

RESOLVED (7 votes for, 3 votes against and 1 abstention)

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

32 COUNTY COUNCIL APPLICATION

33 FOR THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE TO CREATE A BLUE LIGHT CAMPUS COMPRISING OF COMBINED OFFICES AND FACILITIES FOR LINCOLNSHIRE FIRE & RESCUE, LINCOLNSHIRE POLICE AND THE EAST MIDLANDS AMBULANCE SERVICE - LINCOLN HQ FIRE STATION, SOUTH PARK AVENUE, LINCOLN - L/0832/17

Since the publication of the report revised drawings had been submitted to reflect agreed changes to the retained firefighter parking area and also amendments to the wording of several proposed conditions. These changes included an amendment to the finished floor level of the building and a revised schedule of conditions had therefore been proposed to replace those as contained in the report. The revised schedule of conditions which would be attached to any decisions notice issued was detailed in the update to the Committee which could be viewed on the Council's website as follows:-

Tim Joyce, representing the applicant, commented as follows:-

- The proposals were important for the community because it would bring the emergency services together under one building.
- The proposals at South Park were explained.
- 180 staff would be based in the new building.
- The proposed Atrium in the building would provide an opportunity for staff to share experiences and knowledge.
- The building would also allow community groups to meet and cooperate.

Questions by the Committee to Tim Joyce and his responses, included:-

- Was there adequate parking for Retained Firefighters and the public? Tim Joyce stated that there was parking available for up to a maximum of 12 vehicles, with 8 parking spaces at the front for initial responding crews and any additional personnel could park at the rear of the building. He stated that vehicle parking spaces would be hatched to show where Retained Firefighters could park and the "bunker" would remain which had approximately 30 vehicle spaces.
- Was it necessary to cut down all of the trees in front of the new building and was there a planting plan in place? Tim Joyce explained why it was necessary to remove the trees on safety grounds which would give the public time to view emerging emergency vehicles. He stated that he would confirm if there was a landscaping plan in place to offset the removal of the trees.

Responses by officers to comments by the Committee, included:-

- Condition 7 in the report addressed the issue of landscaping.
- A member commented that the new building was welcomed as it would bring all of the emergency services together which would benefit the public and that the removal of the trees was necessary on safety grounds.
- Officers stated that as this was a former brown field site it had been excavated already and it was unlikely that any historical artefacts would be found compared for example to the Lincoln Eastern Bypass development which was a new site.

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

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That planning permission be granted subject to the revised conditions detailed in the update to the Committee.

The meeting closed at 11.55 am

This page is intentionally left blank