



PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE 6 SEPTEMBER 2021

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR I G FLEETWOOD (CHAIRMAN)

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

Councillors: A J Baxter attended the meeting as observers

Officers in attendance:-

Robert Close (Democratic Services Officer), Jeanne Gibson (Programme Leader: Minor Works and Traffic), Neil McBride (Head of Planning), Chris Miller (Team Leader - Countryside Services), Martha Rees (Solicitor) and Jon Sharpe (Principal Development Management Officer)

23 APOLOGIES/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Austin, Hall, Macey and Skinner.

24 DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

No declarations of interest were made with respect to any item on the agenda.

25 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE HELD ON 26TH JULY 2021

RESOLVED:

1. That the minutes be amended to reflect Councillor N H Pepper sent his apologies.
2. That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 26 July 2021, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

26 MINUTES OF THE SITE VISIT TO LAND AT KING STREET, GREATFORD

RESOLVED:

1. That the minutes be amended to reflect that the site visit was held 29 July 2021.
2. That the minutes of the site visit to King Street, Greatford held on 29 July 2021, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

27 TRAFFIC ITEMS

**PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
6 SEPTEMBER 2021**

28 COASTAL COUNTRY PARK - COASTAL ACCESS CAR PARKING CHARGES - POTENTIAL FISHING & RESIDENTIAL PERMITS

The Committee considered a report in relation to the introduction of an off street car parking order that was deferred at the 26 July 2021 meeting as it was considered that further detail was needed regarding the implementation of a system permitting schemes for night fishing and local residents.

In summary, the report outlined that fishing permits would be explored during the winter ready for the next season. With regard to residential permits, car parking charges would only be applicable during the peak hours of the summer season. The complexity of implementing a system for the minority of residents who objected to the proposal wasn't considered to be cost effective; however, it was recommended that this be reviewed over the 2022 summer season to evaluate its efficacy.

Members agreed that the proposals were now acceptable and ultimately felt it necessary that revenue be generated to maintain the facility. Particular appreciation was offered to the review period before implementation.

On a motion proposed by Councillor I G Fleetwood and seconded by I D Carrington, it was:

RESOLVED (10 with 1 abstention (Councillor Mrs Newton))

1. That a self-service, electronic system for the purchase of fishing permits be implemented over the winter season of 2021-2022 and following the implementation of the proposed Off Street Parking Order considered in the previous committee meeting of 26 July 2021
2. That no residential permitting scheme be immediately implemented but that this be kept under review during the period 1 October 2021 to 1 October 2022 to determine whether there was a need to alter this position.
3. That the objections made to proposal details in the off street parking places order presented on the 26 July 2021 be overruled and the proposal become operative.

29 LANGWORTH, BARLINGS LANE - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

The Committee considered a report in connection with three objections received to the proposed introduction of waiting restrictions on Langworth, Barlings Lane. Concerns were raised by Langworth Parish Council regarding parking in the vicinity of the junction of the A158 with Barlings Lane in the village. This sat on a route used by large and agricultural vehicles and the presence of parked vehicles here could lead to the obstruction of traffic flow on both approaches as well as overrunning of the adjacent verges and footways. Objections were raised that the proposed restrictions were too long and risked displacement of parking onto private property. Suggestions were therefore made that other restrictions such as weight limits were introduced instead. Assessment of parking at Barlings Lane indicated however that proposed was the minimum required to ensure vehicular access in and out of this junction was safely maintained. A weight limit couldn't be justified as the vehicles using this lane would most likely be visiting premises situated there so would be exempt from such a restriction.

Members acknowledged that the area was very tight and was subject to limited visibility from the east. In addition, it was noted that sections of Barlings Lane were very narrow and larger vehicles struggled to navigate when busy.

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

RESOLVED (unanimous)

That the objections be overruled so that the order, as advertised, may be introduced.

29a Lincoln, Exchange Road - Proposed Waiting Restrictions

The Committee considered a report in connection with four objections received to the proposed introduction of waiting restrictions on Lincoln, Exchange Road. A number of businesses had raised concerns that access for HGVs (Heavy Goods Vehicles) was being impacted by on street parking in the area. Objections suggested that the proposals would negatively impact businesses and displace parking onto residential streets. Assessment of parking at Exchange Road indicated however that the proposed restrictions aimed to facilitate HGV movements in a predominately commercial and industrial area whilst allowing on street parking where it would not impact on the manoeuvres of larger vehicles, and could be accommodated safely.

Some Members raised concerns that the proposal could be detrimental to businesses on Exchange Road, suggesting that HGV movements were typically expected before commercial traffic activity. However, it was appreciated that unobstructed traffic flow was required for all vehicles to support commerce. It was considered that restrictions may encourage employees to commute to work through different methods.

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

RESOLVED (10 with 1 abstention (Councillor Mrs M Overton))

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.

30 PROPOSED BUS STOP CLEARWAYS - BARKSTON, CHURCH STREET; SUTTON BRIDGE, BRIDGE ROAD; DEEPING ST JAMES, THACKERS WAY AND CROWSON WAY; LINCOLN, WOLSEY WAY

The Committee considered a report in connection with objections received to the proposed introduction of bus stop clearways at Barkston, Church Street; Sutton Bridge, Bridge Road; Deeping St James, Thackers Way and Crowson Way; Lincoln, Wolsey Way. Objections were received at all sites, complaining about the removal of private parking outside properties and businesses. Assessment of proposed bus stop clearways however indicated that it would benefit passengers and improve the service provided by bus companies.

Some Members registered their surprise that two bus stops, as shown in Deeping St James, Thackers Way, were positioned in parallel opposite each other, particularly noting their concern if two buses

**PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE
6 SEPTEMBER 2021**

were to arrive at the same time however unlikely. In addition, Members added that there may be an impact to fire fighters accessing the fire station.

Officers appreciated Members' reservations regarding parallel bus stops and agreed to consider relocation where relevant.

On a motion proposed by Councillor I G Fleetwood and seconded by Councillor I D Carrington, it was:

RESOLVED (10 with 1 abstention (Councillor N H Pepper))

That the objections be overruled and that the clearways, as advertised, be introduced.

31 COUNTY MATTER APPLICATIONS

32 SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT 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 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, that conditional planning permission be granted subject to a Section 106 Planning Obligation to secure the following:

- HGV route restricting access to local villages;
- Creation of a Community Liaison Group/Meeting; and
- Long-term Management Plan for the proposed nature conservation area.

Simon Tucker, Director of David Tucker Associates, was invited to address the Committee in his capacity as applicant for this proposal. All the relevant potential impacts of a proposed gravel quarry had been explored in detail in the application, including a detailed report for all likely impacts including noise, dust, air quality, heritage features, landscape and hydrology. The overall conclusion of those reports was that the scheme was wholly acceptable and policy compliant subject to the usual planning conditions. The scheme had been subject to a detailed Transport Assessment which had been scoped and agreed with the Highway Authority. The planning decision was deferred in July following the debate, specifically on matters of highway safety and the adequacy of the widening proposals agreed with the County Highway Authority. Having listened carefully to the debate and read the minutes of the site visit, Mr Tucker noted the recommendation required the widening of the

road to at least 5.5 metres. It was important to be clear that the accidents on King Street related to speed and failure of cars to judge give way lines. These were not issues which would be exacerbated by the proposed quarry. The introduction of HGV traffic would, if anything, reduce vehicle speeds on the road. It was essential that a proper balance was reached between the width of the road and the scale of development proposed. While necessary to ensure two HGVs could pass, over widening would likely result in yet higher vehicle speeds and potentially also encourage more traffic to use the route instead of the A15. The proposal to widen the road to 5.5 metres was likely appropriate. He agreed with that approach and considered it to deliver the most appropriate form of road which could accommodate the development without resulting in unintended and adverse consequences of an over-widened route. In statistical terms the road was safe and appropriate to serve the development. The site went through a formal Mineral Plan adoption process and was found to be acceptable. He had agreed to mitigation strategies:

- (a) A routing agreement, secured by a S106 agreement, which would prevent movements through nearby villages;
- (b) A carefully designed access, which would direct all HGVs from the site to route south;
- (c) The widening of King Street to at least 5.5m;
- (d) In addition, since the deferral of the application, a commitment to the creation of a liaison committee of local representatives and site operator.

Members sought confirmation that the material extracted would indeed be wet and how the applicant intended to ensure this. Mr Tucker explained that the water extraction was required to avoid digging underwater. Condition 32 would ensure material would stay damp while being extracted.

Vanessa Smith was invited to address the Committee in objection this proposal. HGVs were just over 3 metres wide at their wing mirrors. On a 5.5 metre wide road HGVs were unable to pass each other without going onto the verge as a combined 6 metres exceeded the 5.5 metre road width. Routing all traffic in and out of the quarry via King Street to A1175 junction meant that HGVs would be passing each other many times a day on a 5.5 metre wide and 2 mile long stretch of road, mounting the verges every day. All national guidelines, suggested that at least 6.3 meters was necessary for two-way HGV traffic to pass at low speed. Guidelines were followed in 2016 when Cemex opened a quarry on King Street; and the road was widened to 6.3 metres from the quarry to the A1175 junction. She made reference to a photograph of King Street showing tailbacks north and south as two HGVs struggled to pass. Road widening by the proposed 10cm to accommodate this traffic was ludicrous. The report stated that this occurred during 'exceptional circumstances'. She disagreed, noting temporary closure of the A15, with traffic diverted onto King Street was not too unusual. Furthermore, HGVs trying to pass each other would occur many times each day if these plans went ahead. This was because HGV traffic on King Street would increase from an average of 30 movements per day to well in excess of 100 movements per day with no site restriction. Apart from road width, as an unclassified road, King Street was used by cyclists, horse riders and walkers. These plans would make it too dangerous for them to use as there was no pavement or cycle path. Agricultural machinery in excess of 3 metres wide used King Street on a daily basis during harvest. Anglia Water intended to lay the new Grantham to Bexwell pipeline along this same stretch of King

Street. The average speed on King Street was 57mph with at least 35 per cent of all drivers breaking the speed limit. She understood that it was unreasonable to expect a development to remedy existing road safety issues, however, if such issues needed to be remedied for plans to be safely implemented then this must surely be done, or else they would just exacerbate an existing problem. And whilst an increase in road width could result in an increase in speeding, an inadequately wide road would certainly result in verge erosion, potholes and accidents. If King Street could not be widened, an average 40 mph speed limit must be enforced. She complained that the road was already unlit, undulating, ungritted, straight, fast and damaged; suffering from blind junctions used by hundreds of commuters and was often avoided in winter as it was too hazardous. A more than threefold increase in HGV traffic would displace other road users. And the excessive speed could result in fatalities.

Councillor A Baxter, Deepings West and Rural, was invited to address the Committee as a local Elected Member on this proposal. He agreed with Vanessa Smith's comments regarding the width of the road, adding that it was already a rat run with combination of bikes, cars and HGVs causing a problem. He appreciated the applicant's suggestion that HGVs could slow down the traffic, but their passing could cause accidents or congestion. The road lacked white lanes or traffic marking and suffered from surface damage. The condition of the road should be improved. If the road couldn't be 6.5 metres the whole length, he suggested passing places be included or some extension be made to the width in areas. The HGVs were driven by professional drivers who should know the etiquette of the road. If there was any opportunity to expand the Section 106 agreement for further facilities to the area it should be explored.

Councillor G Taylor, Greatford Parish Council, was invited to address the Committee as a local Elected Member for this proposal. She noted that previously, Members suggested that this development could be here for a long time, so she felt it was important that the decision was right. It was clear to all local parish councils and over 160 local objectors that the applicant had gotten this really wrong. King Street had a collision rate higher than national average, over 23 collisions in just the last 5 years. The Applicants Transport Statement included no assessment of impacts at the main junction of King Street and the A1175, despite this being the proposed route. This was a junction with a history of collisions. Also, it showed no collisions at Stowe Road junction, yet the Council's data showed five had occurred, including recent fatal collisions. While appreciating that accidents sometimes happen, it wasn't clear why the applicant had not assessed the risks at these junctions. It was surprising that the officers' report stated that the Transport Statement's analysis of road safety was appropriate with these flaws. Councillor Taylor showed photographs of HGVs using both lanes and increased usage from closure. The Council claimed that road design advice referred to the design manual for Roads and Bridges, which identified 7.3 metres as being appropriate for a road of this nature. While a previous applicant proposed their access road could be widen to 7.3 metres. She questioned why the Council now identified 5.5 metres as being wide enough for an unlit, ungritted road commonly used by cyclists and routes to school. Independent road safety experts said that HGVs travelling at speed along a road of just 5.5 metres in width could result in a number of different types of collisions. To compromise road safety guidance risked lives. While the Council said routing could be managed by a Section 106 agreement, the experience of villagers hadn't suggested the efficacy of agreements. There were no clear arrangements what the implications of non-compliance were.

Members sought further clarification if officers sought guidance from the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges or Manual for Streets for existing roads. It was explained that both documents were technical manuals for highways but targeted rural and urban roads respectively. Manual for Streets was typically used by the Principal Highways Officer which identified 5.5 metres as being sufficient for both vehicles to pass. It was appreciated however this may be more appropriate for an urban environment. After measuring the width of some HGVs it was recognised that 1 foot of room would be available between wing mirrors which may not be sufficient. 6 metres may be more appropriate without being particularly more expensive. It was also reiterated that an increase in road widths could often result in an increase in speeds. Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership were reluctant to widen the road any more than 5 metres. Members felt that the site visit enabled them to appreciate further how close HGVs would get to each other when passing. Particular concern was felt when considering the increased prevalence of extended wing mirrors on HGVs. In addition, Members noted that their experience on the site visit highlighted the importance of not increasing traffic speeds on King Road.

Some Members weren't convinced at the suggestion that drivers would slow down naturally as the road narrowed. A Member suggested that increased road markings may give the impression of a narrower road while offering the safety of a wider road.

Some Members suggested that, if approved, a condition should be amended to extend the road width to 6 metres rather than 5.5 metres.

While appreciating the issues with King Road raised by the objectors, some Members felt that this one application couldn't reasonably be expected to resolve all of its existing problems.

Referencing the local deliveries mentioned within the officers' report, Members asked what actually constituted a local delivery. It was explained that local deliveries were summarised as deliveries to residents within the Greatford Village, however a legal definition would be sought if approved.

The increased planting protection identified by the applicant was appreciated by Members. It was advised that this was only identified within the report and hadn't been specifically recommended as part of condition seven. Members observed that this was an allocated site and would yield economic benefits if approved.

On a motion proposed by Councillor Mrs M Overton and seconded by Councillor N H Pepper, it was:

RESOLVED (8 with 1 abstention (Councillor I G Fleetwood))

That the application be approved as per the officers' conditions, with the following amendments:

1. That Condition 7 be amended to read:

No development shall take place until full details of an advanced landscape screening, tree and hedge planting scheme have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Mineral Planning Authority. The landscape screening, tree and hedge planting scheme shall include information on perimeter screen bund construction; species, numbers, spacing and locations of all grasses, trees, shrubs and hedgerows to be planted as part of the development including along the entire length of the sites eastern boundary between the

site and King Street. Thereafter the landscaping and planting shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. All planting shall be maintained weed free for the duration of the development during which all losses shall be replaced in the following planting season.

Reason: To ensure that the advance screening measures proposed for the site are carried out and maintained to reduce the visual impacts for the duration of the development.

2. That Condition 13 be amended to read:

No winning and working of mineral shall take place until the Site Access has been constructed and the highway improvement works, comprising of the widening of King Street to a width of not less than 6.0 metres have first been carried out and completed to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority (in consultation with the Highway Authority). For avoidance of doubt the widening and improvement works shall be constructed between the Site Access and the King Street/Stowe Road junction south of the Site within the limits of the public highway.

Reason: To ensure the highway improvement works identified as necessary to support the development are carried out so as to allow quarry traffic to safely pass on the public highway. *See Informative (i) for further information.

3. That the appendix referenced be amended from Appendix C to Appendix B.

The meeting closed at 12.03 pm