



**PLANNING AND REGULATION
COMMITTEE
7 OCTOBER 2019**

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR I G FLEETWOOD (CHAIRMAN)

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

Officers in attendance:-

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

22 APOLOGIES/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H Spratt and M J Storer.

23 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Councillor R P H Reid requested that a note should be made in the minutes that he was the local Member, lived in Austerby and that he would participate in the debate but would not vote on this matter (minute 27).

The Chairman stated that all members had been lobbied in connection with this matter and that he had received an email from someone at 10.45pm on 6 October 2019 on the same matter (minute 27).

**24 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND
REGULATION COMMITTEE HELD ON 2 SEPTEMBER 2019**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 2 September 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

25 TRAFFIC ITEMS

26 POTTERHANWORTH, MAIN ROAD

The Committee received a report in connection with objections received to proposals to introduce mandatory school keep clear markings in place of the current advisory ones outside of the primary school located at the junction of Barff Road with Main Road, B1202, Potterhanworth. Following discussions between officers and

representatives of the school in April 2019 the proposals had been amended to allow the unrestricted parking to remain in front of the school as detailed in Appendix B of the report which would help parents to drop their children off.

Officers stated that the local Member supported the recommendations.

The report detailed the objections received and the comments of officers on the objections.

Comments by members included:-

- Whether the Council had sufficient resources to ensure enforcement of the Orders. Officers stated that the police did not have the sufficient resources to deal with parking enforcement and that the Council had the necessary resources to deal with this matter through its Civil Parking Enforcement team. Officers stated that the proposals would address the bends on the roads in the vicinity of the school and added that a lot of the Main Street was left unrestricted.
- The consultations carried out had been thorough.

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

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the objections be overruled and that the making of a Traffic Regulation Order including the minor modification as detailed in Appendix B of the report be approved.

27 SOUTH ROAD, BOURNE (A15) - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

The Committee received a report in connection with objections received to the introduction of proposed waiting restrictions on South Road, Bourne. Officers stated that consultation with local bus companies indicated that the originally proposed times of operation for the Bus Stop Clearways should be extended to 6am-9am daily and this amendment had been agreed with the revised proposal shown in Appendix B of the report.

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

Comments by members included:-

- The proposals were welcomed by both the local member and the neighbouring local member as the problems had existed for some time.
- A large number of buses visited the school and buses and pupils' safety were important.
- The proposals would improve the flow of traffic and restrict overtaking which would help road safety.

- A recent accident had led to a pupil breaking his legs.
- Some properties in this area did not have off-street parking.
- It was noted that many properties in the county that did not have off-street parking, e.g. the West End of Lincoln.

RESOLVED (12 for, 0 against and 1 abstention)

That the objections be overruled and that the Traffic Regulation Order be approved.

28 SHEPEAU STOW/HOLBEACH DROVE B1166 - PROPOSED 50MPH SPEED LIMIT

The Committee received a report in connection with objections received to the proposed new 50mph speed limit on the B1166 Drove Road between Shepeau Stow and Holbeach Drove but the proposed 30mph speed limits on the Dog Drove North and South as detailed on Appendix B of the report were supported locally. Officers stated that Holbeach Parish Council, not previously consulted, now supported the recommendations in the report.

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

Comments by the local member, who was a member of the Committee, included:-

- He lived relatively close to the area of the proposed speed reduction and knew it well.
- He was aware that the main objector had requested to speak at the meeting but had not been allowed because the public were not allowed to speak on traffic matters.
- The length of road to be covered by the proposed 50mph speed limit was about ½ mile in length and residents had for some time been angry about the present arrangements where a 60mph existed for a short length of the B1166 between the two 40mph speed limits either side of it. The public wanted a 40mph speed limit on the B1166 at this location.
- The Mean Speed reported was nearly a year old and since that time a large distribution centre had been built in the vicinity and there were regular deliveries by large HGVs who had no option but to use the B1166. Agricultural vehicles also used the road and all this traffic would have brought the Mean Speed down since the data was collected in January.
- There were no footpaths between Whaplode Drove and the location of the nearby school in Shepeau Stow and there was a deep ditch on one side of the B1166.
- The B1166 was not densely populated but highways were proposing to reduce the 60mph speed limit to a 30mph speed limit on Dog Drove South. Residents were confused that highways were proposing to introduce this limit on a road where there had been no accidents but that the road they had concerns about it was proposed to introduce a 50mph speed limit.

**PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
7 OCTOBER 2019**

- There was little chance of any enforcement of the speed limit and the only option was to use Speed Watch volunteers but they could only operate in 30mph or 40mph areas.
- The accident figures shown were only for the last five years. He stated that having previously worked in the Fire Service at Crowland, he had recalled attending numerous serious accidents along the B1166 mainly at both crossroads.
- Horse riders used the B1166 to get to quieter roads because there stables were located off this stretch of road.
- It was noted that the objectors had requested various speed reduction devices but none of these could be provided. If a 40mph speed limit was introduced there would not be any need to erect new signage as the current 40mph speed limit signs in both villages could be used.
- The local MP, who lived locally, supported the objectors.
- While noting that the officers were required to follow by the Speed Limit Policy it was in the remit of the Committee to make a decision on what, in his opinion, was a special case.
- He moved that an exception should be made to the Speed Limit Policy and that the speed limit should be reduced from 60mph to 40mph instead of the 50mph on the B1166 in the interests of road safety.

Officers stated that over the past five years there had been three injury accidents along the length of road under consideration and an accident rate of 36 had been calculated, which justified the introduction of a speed limit. Officers explained that the speed limit was set in accordance with the Mean Speed of traffic which had been measured at 49mph as shown in Appendix C of the report and this was in accordance with the Speed Limit Policy approved by the Council in 2015.

Comments by members included:-

- If the current 40mph speed limit was extended between Shepeau Stow and Holbeach Drove the Mean Speed would be reduced.
- There were few street lights on the B1166, there were cross roads and there was a deep ditch on one side of the road.
- The local member had made a positive case for the introduction of a 40mph speed limit and it should be considered a special case.
- If there was a 40mph speed limit along this stretch of road this would mean traffic would not have an opportunity to speed up when it left the villages of Shepeau Stow and Holbeach Drove.
- Was there a need to re-consult the Parish Councils if a 40mph speed limit was proposed? Officers stated that Parish Councils and other agencies would need to be consulted.
- A site visit was suggested but this did not receive support.
- Could consideration of the proposals be deferred until the outcome of consultations to introduce a 40mph speed limit were known? Officers stated that it could take some months before the outcome of consultations on a 40mph were known.

Following further discussion on the proposals which included support for the introduction of a 40mph, support for the officer recommendation, the need to work within the current Speed Limit Policy and the need for the Executive Councillor for Highways, Transport and IT to review the Policy due to the extra traffic on the roads, it was -

RESOLVED (9 votes for, 2 against and 0 against)

- (a) That the objections be overruled and that the Traffic Regulation Order be approved for public advertisement as detailed in Appendix B of the report.
- (b) That, on implementation, the Order be monitored by officers, the local member and Parish Councils and reviewed in the future.
- (c) That the Executive Councillor for Highways, Transport and IT be requested to review the Speed Limit Policy due to of the increase in traffic in recent years.

29 COUNTY MATTER APPLICATIONS

30 EXTENSION TO WEST DEEPING QUARRY AT WEST DEEPING QUARRY, KING STREET, WEST DEEPING - HEATON PLANNING - S19/0486

As both this application and the application at minute 31 were connected to the same site, with the consent of the Committee, it was agreed to use the same power point presentation for both applications.

Since the publication of the report the plan reference cited in recommended conditions 3, 17, 18 and 19 had been amended and the Main Modifications proposed in the emerging South Kesteven Local Plan 2011-2036 as detailed in the update which had been circulated to the Committee and published on the Council's website.

It was agreed that Graeme King's (representing the applicant) comments would apply to this application and the application at minute 31:-

- The extension formed a phase of the overall scheme of working for the quarry. The approved Review of Old Minerals Permission (ROMP) area had an estimated extractive life of approximately 4 years. The extension block contained around 350,000 tonnes and would extend the life of the operations by an additional 18 months.
- The applications also sought permission to allow for the transport and delivery of small volumes of silt materials, arising from the mineral processing off King Street for integration and use in the site's restoration.
- Both submissions were accompanied by Environmental Impact Assessments which concluded that the proposed developments could be carried out without giving rise to any significant adverse environmental impact.
- Both applications did not propose to increase the current output levels or alteration of the existing hours of operation and the same processes would continue to take place.

- The modest extension would be easily integrated into the overall phasing of mineral extraction and would ensure that mineral was not needlessly sterilised. From an operational perspective it would be difficult to return to this small area and extract at a later date thus making the resource non-viable to work as an independent unit.
- As was the current practice, all mineral extracted would be conveyed to the processing plant off King Street. The existing S106 Agreement was unaffected and would continue to control HGV routing, archaeological investigation and long-term aftercare. Planning conditions were in place to mitigate potential environmental impacts. Additional requirements for restoration and aftercare had been secured as well as preserving features of ecological interest and the long-term management of the water environment.
- The Company was committed to minimising any potential local effects whilst making a positive contribution to the local economy. Upon acquisition of the site back in 2017 Breedon had immediately established a liaison committee to engage with the local community and to keeping everyone informed on operations taking place and intentions for the future. The Committee met twice a year and the general consensus was that it had proved to be really useful.
- The recommendations were supported and the Committee was requested to grant planning permission subject to appropriate conditions. The Company would continue to liaise and work with both the Council and the local community in maintaining mineral supplies from the quarry whilst properly controlling the operation of the site.

Questions by members to Graeme King, included:-

- The local press had published an article about HGV routing in the area. A garden centre was located near the King Street junction and the use of King Street by HGVs was inappropriate. Graeme King stated that HGV traffic from his quarry was required to turn right when exiting the quarry and they did not use King Street. Officers stated that a Section 106 Agreement was in place which meant that traffic from the applicant's site was required to turn right and head in a southerly direction. Officers thought the press article might have been referring to information provided from an Exhibition in connection with the proposed "Greatford application" for the extraction of sand and gravel.
- Was silt being transported out of the King Street entrance using the two exits? Graeme King stated that it was proposed to return a proportion of the residual materials from the processing plant (silt) at King Street and this would be incorporated into the restoration of agriculture. This involved up to 100 vehicles annually turning right at the cross roads and this was a modest movement of vehicles.
- Why was the area proposed for extraction not included in the original application? Graeme King explained that when assembling land deals it was sometimes not possible to secure the area because of ownership issues.

On a motion by Councillor D Brailsford, seconded by Councillor R P H Reid, it was –

RESOLVED (unanimous)

- (a) That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report, taking into account the revisions identified in the Update.
- (b) That this report (including appendices) forms part of the Council's Statement pursuant to Regulation 24 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 – 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.

31 APPLICATION FOR THE DETERMINATION OF NEW (UPDATED) CONDITIONS TO WHICH A MINING SITE IS TO BE SUBJECT (ENVIRONMENT ACT 1995: PERIODIC REVIEW) AT WEST DEEPING QUARRY, KING STREET, WEST DEEPING - HEATON PLANNING - S19/0497

Since the publication of the report the plan reference cited in recommended conditions 3, 17, 18 and 19 had been amended and Main Modifications had been proposed to the emerging South Kesteven Local Plan 2011-2036 as detailed in the update which had been circulated to the Committee and published on the Council's website.

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

RESOLVED (unanimous)

- (a) That the amended schedule of conditions as detailed in Appendix B be approved, taking into account the revisions identified in the Update.
- (b) That this report (including appendices) forms part of the Council's Statement pursuant to Regulation 24 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 – 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;

8

PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE

7 OCTOBER 2019

- 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.

The meeting closed at 11.50 am