

Present:

Chairman: Councillor Tom Ashton
Vice-Chairman: Councillor Frank Pickett

Councillors: Alison Austin, Peter Bedford, Michael Cooper, Paul Goodale, Neill Hastie, Jonathan Noble, Brian Rush, Chelcei Sharman, Paul Skinner, Yvonne Stevens and Peter Watson

Officers: Growth Manager, Senior Planning Officer, Legal Advisor, Legal Services Lincolnshire and Senior Democratic Services Officer

25 MINUTES

The minutes of the Committee's last meeting, held on 23rd July 2019, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, with the amendment to show that Councillor Rush was a substitute Member of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee.

26 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Standing declarations of interest were noted for :

Councillors Tom Ashton and Alison Austin in their respective roles as Members of Lincolnshire County Council.

Councillors Tom Ashton, Michael Cooper and Neill Hastie in their roles as Members of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee, Councillor Jonathan Noble as a Substitute Member of that Committee and Councillor Alison Austin as the County Council representative on that Committee.

Councillors Tom Ashton, Frank Pickett, Peter Bedford and Michael Cooper in their respective roles as representatives on the Internal Drainage Boards.

Individual declarations of interest were then made as follows:

With respect to Planning Application B/19/0068 Councillor Yvonne Stevens declared that she had viewed the site 15 years previously to consider purchasing the land.

27 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

28 PLANNING APPLICATION B 19 0068

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of terrace block of 5 three storey dwellings with new access and associated site works.

118 Church Road Boston PE21 0LG

Mrs B Orrey

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report and advised Members that the visuals and letter from the applicant received after publication of the agenda pack, which Members confirmed they had received, were not a true reflection of the application and that it was the application as it was presented at the meeting that the Committee had to consider.

The following representations, received following publication of the agenda pack, were reported to the meeting:

- A letter of objection giving the grounds as insufficient parking in an overpopulated area and the danger to cyclists.
- 8 letters of support on the grounds that the proposal would improve the town; the design would tie together existing styles; development would remove an eyesore and stop trouble taking place; and approval of the contemporary design.

Mr J Cartwright then addressed the Committee and spoke in objection to the proposals on the following grounds:

- Loss of privacy and sunlight to neighbours, whom he had discussed the proposals with, as the block would dominate neighbouring properties, especially the bungalows and properties on Windsor Close;
- The site was too small and the proposed dwellings would have a negative impact, as they would be out of character in an area where none had flat roofs, all being two-storey with gable roofs, and permission for the site next door had been limited to 2-storey.
- Tandem parking was not ideal, particularly at this point where there was a bend on a busy road.
- There was no objection to the redevelopment of the site, but the quality of this design would lower the standards of the area.

The applicant, Mrs B Orrey, then addressed the Committee and described her vision of the provision of low carbon properties with affordable housing. This site had once been used as commercial premises and permission had been granted previously for a house in multiple occupation (HMO) to house nine people. The site was an eyesore and security fencing had had to be erected. The proposed dwellings were modern and would appeal to new buyers and encourage carbon neutral travel, with provision of electric vehicle charging points, bicycle stores and ability to walk to local facilities.

Mrs Orrey asserted that everything had been done in line with the Committee's wishes, including the use of traditional materials, alteration of the roof pitch and frames, and local traders and suppliers had been used. The proposal would encourage more new ideas and would be a focal point in the same way as the new college building.

The applicant's agent, Mr C Wicks, shared the speaking time with the applicant and quoted views previously expressed by a Planning Officer dealing with the application, who had confirmed that the separation distances and the mass and scale of the proposals were acceptable, pointing out that there were ten terrace dwellings nearby of a greater width. The design was modern; this was the way forward and it was unfortunate that the potential of the design had not been recognised.

It was moved by Councillor Jonathan Noble and seconded by Councillor Brian Rush that the application be refused on the grounds of the previous reasons for refusal, in line with the Planning Officer's recommendation, that it contravened Policy 2 (Development Management) and Policy 3 (Design of New Development) of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan and would not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Following debate regarding the submission of late changes to the application, and the Growth Manager's confirmation that these changes would need to be the subject of the due process of consultation before they could be considered, Members discussed deferring the application.

It was then proposed by Councillor Peter Bedford that the application be deferred in order that the amended application could be considered at a future meeting and this was seconded by Councillor Alison Austin.

At this point, Councillor Brian Rush confirmed that he was withdrawing his support for the proposal to refuse planning permission in favour of deferring the application. Councillor Paul Skinner then seconded the proposal to refuse planning permission.

The proposal to defer the application was then taken as an amendment and was carried.

Vote: 11 for, 2 against.

The substantive motion to defer was then put to the vote.

Vote: 11 for, 2 against.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred in order that the due process of consultation can be carried out on the amended application and considered at a future meeting.

29 PLANNING APPLICATION B 18 0370

Erection of 3 no. three storey apartment blocks consisting of 55 no. flats including some amenity facilities, following demolition of existing public house.

Former New Castle Inn and adjoining land on Lister Way 36 Fydell Street Boston PE21 8LF

Dhedhi, Alrahmin Trust

The Growth Manager presented the application and reported the 10 additional representations had been received since the publication of the agenda pack, objecting

to the lack of car parking in the area and the 'zero parking' proposal within the application.

The applicant's agent, Mr C Lilley, addressed the Committee saying this was a substantial vacant site that had been a long-standing eyesore. It was in a perfect location for all amenities and transport links. The high quality design, including landscaping and a private courtyard, would provide living accommodation of exceptional quality along with a number of affordable homes and a section 106 contribution, so adding to the rejuvenation of Boston.

Mr Lilley stated that the site was in a highly accessible part of Boston. No parking was proposed so as not to impede traffic flow; there would not be the conflict that a limited number of parking spaces could cause and there would be no junctions needed to exit the site. The existing access would have removable bollards for refuse collection and other vehicles and they would be able to turn on the site without compromising highway safety. Also, storage for scooters and cycles would be provided. The Highway Authority fully supported the proposal.

Councillor Paul Goodale, speaking as the Local Ward Member, considered the design and plan acceptable, but could not accept the proposal for zero parking provision, as the residents would certainly have cars and there was a significant level of illegal parking in the area already. Councillor Goodale was also concerned about the adverse impact on the amenity of the area in terms of the overshadowing of neighbouring residential properties.

During debate, other Members raised concerns regarding the size and scale of the proposal and the adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity, particularly overshadowing of the houses opposite, as well as concerns regarding inadequate bin storage and the flood risk sequential test not having been met.

In particular, Members considered that, due to the 'zero' provision of parking on the site, the proposal would lead to a significant adverse impact on traffic congestion in an area already congested, as it was inevitable that the residents of the 55 proposed units would own cars. Some Members also commented on the scale of the development and the potential impact on the character of the area in relation to visual intrusion. References to the proposals being contrary to policies 2 and 3 of the Development Plan were made.

Some Members commented that the design was of good quality and the accommodation was much needed; that the scale of the proposal was acceptable and that parking was the only issue, with other developments recently approved having been required to provide parking spaces. Other Members considered that zero provision of parking would not be problematic, that it was in keeping with the area and nearby under-utilised car parks would be used, and pointed out that no objections had been put forward by the Highway Authority.

However, most Members considered that the proposal was not acceptable on the grounds of the adverse impact of zero parking provision and the scale of the proposal.

It was then proposed by Councillor Paul Goodale and seconded by Councillor Jonathan Noble that planning permission be refused.

[Councillor Brian Rush left the meeting at 11.35 am]

The Committee then adjourned temporarily to allow the Growth Manager to formulate the wording of the reasons for refusal, which was then agreed.

Vote: 8 for, 4 against

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused, contrary to the Planning Officer's recommendations, on the following grounds:

- 1. The proposal, by virtue of the lack of parking provision, would provide insufficient facilities for future residents and would be likely to exacerbate existing parking pressures within the area to an unacceptable degree. The proposals would therefore be contrary to policies 2, 3 and 36 of the Local Plan and the principles of sustainable development as advocated by the NPPF.**
- 2. By virtue of its amount, scale, size and density, the development would result in a visually intrusive and dominant form of development having an adverse impact upon the character of the area, and the amenities of existing properties in the area (in particular those in Fydell Street by way of overshadowing), contrary to policies 2, and 3 of the Local Plan and the principles of good design and sustainable development as advocated by the NPPF.**

30 APPEAL DECISIONS

A Report by the Growth Manager in respect of planning applications:

- B/18/0272 Burnham Lane and Marsh Lane Skeldyke Kirton Boston
- B/18/0434 Land at Puttock Gate Fosdyke Boston

Members noted that the Planning Inspector had allowed the appeal in respect of B/18/0434 despite the application site being outside

31 DELEGATED DECISION LIST

A standing report by the Growth Manager. Members agreed that this item was no longer required to be published as part of the agenda, as the information was already published and made available to Members each week.

32 APPEALS RECEIVED

A standing report by the Growth Manager. Members agreed that this item was no longer required to be published as part of the agenda, as the information was already published and made available to Members each week.

The Meeting ended at 12.20 pm