

**MINUTES OF THE LOUTH TOWN COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE BRITISH LEGION HALL, LOUTH
ON TUESDAY 30th APRIL 2019**

Present Councillor D.J.E. Hall (DJEH) (in the chair).

Councillors: Mrs. E. Ballard (EB), Mrs. D. Blakey (DB), Mrs. S. Crew (SC), D. Ford (DF), Mrs. L. Harrison-Wiseman (LHW), D. Hobson (DH), G.E. Horton (GEH), R. Jackson (RJ), A. Leonard (AL), M. Locking (ML), Mrs. S.E. Locking (SEL), Mrs. J. Makinson-Sanders (JMS), Mrs. M. Ottaway (MO) and F.W.P. Treanor (FWPT) and Mrs. (PFW).

Councillors not present: C. Green (CG), L.M. Stephenson (LMS), D. Turner (DT), J. Garrett (JG) and D.E. Wing (DEW).

The Town Clerk, Mrs. L.M. Phillips, the Town Clerk's Assistant, Mrs. M. Vincent one member of the press and 14 members of the public were also present.

- A member of the public spoke of her concerns regarding the application to build a new sports hall on the land belonging to King Edward VI School on the Horncastle Road. The resident spoke of the view that had been there for 500 years and asked that the Town Council fight to protect that view and to oppose the application of such a large building in that location. The resident continued that people were unaware of just how big the building would be and that it was an 'off-the-peg' design unsuitable for a conservation area.
- A member of the public spoke about the King Edward VI Grammar School planning application and agreed that it was a good idea to have a new sports centre, but not in that location. The resident continued that the 'build' didn't fit in with the Louth Plan and that the fabrics were not suitable for a conservation area, and that the building would be much larger than others on the site. They continued that there was much information missing off of the planning application including details of the disposal of surface water and parking access.
- A member of the public wished to object to the planning application for the 60 properties at the bottom of Eastfield Road, a continuation from 'phase 1'. They stated that 'phase 2' was rejected originally but have now been told that this can go through, a site that was agricultural land with the field adjacent not being approved for development. They continued that they felt the development was too dense, drainage had not been properly considered and the over use of the single access road.
- A member of the public spoke to thank the Town Council for their assistance with the support and promotion of Pie Day in Louth on April 3rd 2019. 8 shops had taken part with over 2100 pieces of pie sold on the day. Any extra money raised had been donated to ECHO (local food for homeless charity). They reported that there had been excellent coverage before the day from the press and radio and ELDC had also committed to supporting the event (print and design) for a further two years. Cllr. Mrs. MO MBE was also thanked for her help as a judge. The winners were the Toadstool Café.

419. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. LMS, DEW and JG.

420. Declarations of Interest / Dispensations

The following declarations of interest were made:

- a. Cllr. RJ - Items 4 and 5 - as a member of ELDC.
- b. Cllr. FWPT - planning application 10 - as an acquaintance
- c. Cllr. DH - planning item 2 - as a director of another academy
- d. Cllr. DF - planning item 4 and 7 - neighbouring houses
- e. Cllr. Mrs. PFW – any items related to ELDC and planning item 2 as a member of ELDC and director of Magna Vitae
- f. Cllr. Mrs. JMS - Items 4 and 5 - as a member of ELDC.
- g. Cllr. Mrs. SEL - planning item 2 as Warden of King Edward VI ASEC and ex officio of KEVIET. (abstained on vote) planning item 5 as friends
- h. Cllr. Mrs. SC - As a member of the King Edward's VI Almshouse, School and Educational Charity at Louth.
- i. Cllr. Mrs. EB - As a member of the King Edward's VI Almshouse, School and Educational Charity at Louth.

421. Minutes

It was **RESOLVED** that the notes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 2nd April 2019 be approved as the Minutes.

422. Applications received by the Local Planning Authority

The Committee considered all planning applications received, including those listed in the schedule (PA/Schedule 04-30-19) and **RESOLVED** as follows:

- a. N/105/00432/19 - supported this application with the condition that required infrastructure be in place before any building takes place.
- b. N/105/00440/19 - objected to this application as it did not think that the proposed location of the building, on the southern boundary of the main school field within the Louth Conservation Area, was the best choice of site and would prefer to see such a development on the footprint of Crowtree House (also owned by King Edwards and which is unused and has been for a number of years). LTC strongly felt that the location of this development should be reconsidered and opined that the Crowtree House land lent itself far more usefully to the project. The Crowtree House site does not have a problem with drainage (the proposed site suffers greatly from waterlog), has direct access/exit to Crowtree Lane for users of the hall, servicing and emergency services (the proposed site has no proper access/exit other than right through the middle of the school and plans do not detail how this might be achieved rather they infer that no proper provision for access/exit will be made). The Crowtree House site would enable disabled parking to be located so as to ensure that there was no contravention of the Disability Discrimination Act. The proposed location offers no parking in the vicinity of the building without an uphill journey of over 150m and as such the plans do not comply with DDA regulations.

LTC felt that development on the southern boundary of the main school field would result in a loss of public visual amenity, have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of Louth's Conservation Area and on nearby Listed Buildings as views of the Grade I Listed St. James' Church and the Grade II Listed 'The Lodge' would be obscured by the development of the new sports hall. These views from Horncastle Road had been enjoyed for decades by residents of Louth and visitors alike as this is one of the main and most attractive entrances to the town.

LTC were concerned about the adequacy of the drainage provisions. The application states that foul and surface water would be dealt with by way of a soakaway but the proposed site is known to be waterlogged and therefore unsuitable for soakaways.

LTC noted that development of the proposed site would severely impact use of existing outdoor sporting facilities for instance rendering the existing cricket pitch unusable. LTC considered that all losses of outdoor sporting amenity should be re-provided in other locations and details of their re-provision should be included within this application.

Further, LTC considered that the proposed development was of an overbearing nature, it being significantly larger than any other building in the area, its design and appearance were not in keeping with the surroundings and would set a dangerous precedent in the conservation area. LTC were also concerned that this development would be the cause of both light and noise pollution for local residents and felt that it would undoubtedly damage the roots of nearby trees possibly causing a loss of trees and ecological habitats. LTC wished to draw attention to the many, concise and well researched letters of objection lodged with ELDC and implored ELDC to refuse this planning application based on these.

Finally, LTC wished to make known their agreement with resident's observations made following FOI requests (see attached letter).

- c. N/105/00593/19 - objected to this application on the grounds that the proximity of properties 11 and 12 to properties 32 and 33 would be so close as to breach human rights. The proposal is over-intensive and overbearing in nature and too dense when compared to most other developments in Louth. Drainage detail is not sufficient to mitigate concerns over flood risk. Further concerns were raised over the planned position of the attenuation pond, which it was felt would be better placed in the centre of the development, where the land naturally dips and is often boggy. Councillors were of the opinion that the Ecology Report from 2017 would be out of date after all of the movement and building that has taken place during phase 1 of this development (any animals most likely having been displaced because of this) and so felt that the report needed updating. LTC did not feel that NPPF 108c had been complied with. Section 108 states: In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:...
- c) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. LTC do not feel that one entrance and exit for the site for this significant number of houses on a bad bend and a road which is narrow meets this criteria.

LTC were also concerned about the cumulative traffic impact on the town. This development will create a need for infrastructure improvements to the road which should be addressed in line with the East Lindsey Core Strategy page 127 point 15.7 as roads are in a poor state currently and improvements have not, so far, been forthcoming. LTC requested that Cllr. Jackson call this application in.

- d. N/105/00569/19 - objected to this application on the grounds of overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy as although the plans have been altered from 3 houses to 2 bungalows, the ground height of the development has not been altered and the change in footprint brings the development closer to the boundary of neighbouring properties.
- e. N/105/00606/19 - supported this application.
- f. N/105/00611/19 - objected to this application as a Flood Risk Assessment had not been provided, it was of the opinion that additional traffic calming measures were needed and the Highways Reports provided were out of date. LTC had concerns that water pressure at properties on neighbouring Fanthorpe Lane were low currently and the infrastructure in the area could not cope at present, the proposed development would have further detrimental effects on both of these. LTC also felt that previous neighbour objections were still valid.
- g. N/105/00621/19 - objected to this application on the grounds that a new house on the proposed site would have a detrimental effect on Louth's Conservation Area as its design and appearance (being new) would not be in keeping with the current properties and surroundings on Union Street.
- h. N/105/00631/19 – objected to this application as it felt that conditions are imposed for a reason and should be complied with. It also wished to reiterate its previous reasons for objection, these being: The constrictions of the site by the river and existing properties and the maximisation of quantity has led to this development being too dense and has created serious overlooking issues for 4 of the properties with less than the required distances window to window being achieved. The construction of dwellings at this location will cause a serious threat to the wildlife and ecology of the area from pollution, loss of habitat and disturbance. There are known to be bat colonies in the area and a bat survey has not been provided. There will be a cumulative traffic impact with other recently approved developments on Eastfield Road. There are known unresolved flooding issues along this road and there is a danger that development on this site will transfer the flooding impact onto other neighbouring properties. Some of the land also falls within a medium flood risk from the river. There are plans to reinvigorate the canal as a green corridor through Louth and the development could pose a risk to this boost to the local economy through tourism.
- i. N/105/00661/19 & N/105/00662/19 - objected to this application on the grounds that the materials proposed for use would have a detrimental effect on the appearance and character of the Louth Conservation Area and these Grade II Listed Buildings.
- j. N/105/00684/19 - supported this application.
- k. PL/0068/19 - supported this application.

423. Proposed Works to Trees in the Conservation Area

It was **RESOLVED** to support the proposed tree work at 31 Horncastle Road.

424. Next Meeting

The Committee noted that the date of the next scheduled Planning Committee meeting was 21st May 2019.

The Meeting Closed at 6.40pm.

Signed _____ (Chairman) Dated _____