

MINUTES OF NETTLEHAM PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING LIAISON COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON TUESDAY 14 JUNE 2016
IN THE MEETING ROOM, THE OLD SCHOOL, NETTLEHAM AT 5.30PM

PRESENT: Councillors J Downs, J Evans (*ex-officio*), J Siddall (*ex-officio*), M Spencer, Mrs A White, Mrs S Harland and J Hill.

In attendance: Father R Crossland (for Agenda Item 5 only) and J Finn (Parish Clerk).

01/16. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

It was unanimously **RESOLVED** that Cllr J Downs be elected Chair of the Council's Planning Liaison Committee.

02/16. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

03/16. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS

None.

04/16. PLANNING MATTERS

(a) To discuss recommendations regarding comments/observations/objections on the following planning applications to be submitted to WLDC

(1) Land adj to 2a Poachers Meadow Truelove Property & Construction Ltd **Ref: 134325**

Planning application to erect 1no. four bedroom dwelling

The Parish Council's Planning Liaison Committee strongly objects to the proposed development.

The proposed development represents an unwelcome proliferation of tandem development behind number 2/2b Poachers Meadow with access off an extended single track drive passing 3 bungalows, one completed and 2 under construction. The proposal represents an extension of the built area on what was originally a back garden and now is becoming a housing development in the midst of a low-density established development. The traffic flow past existing houses on the site would represent an unreasonable disturbance and also could represent a safety hazard for pedestrians, residents and visitors to the existing homes. The new house is out of character and over dominant compared with the surrounding bungalows and would also overlook the back gardens of several adjacent properties thus reducing their amenity value.

The previous application to put a 4 bedroom house on this site (P/A 133684) was refused. This proposal also being a 4 bed house on a small plot being a tandem backland development surrounded by bungalows would be over dominant. This contrary to the West-Lindsey District Council Local Plan first review 2006 policy RES 3.

1. We believe that the proposal fails: WLDC POLICY RES 3 – BACKLAND AND TANDEM DEVELOPMENT

Backland or tandem development will not be permitted where it will lead to one or more of the following:

i. A significant and adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupier of the existing property which is sited to the front of the proposal by virtue of:

a. Overlooking and loss of privacy;

c. A significant level of nuisance resulting from the movement of vehicles to and from proposed development past existing residences;

ii. It would adversely affect the general quality and character of the area in which the proposal would be located by virtue of:

a. Increasing the density of development in that area to an unacceptably high level;

c. Leading to an unacceptable proliferation of vehicular accesses on to a street to the detriment of highway safety and to the character of the street scene;

Justification

1.19 There will be very limited circumstances in which backland or tandem development may be acceptable. This is because the general character and amenity of the built environment needs to be protected. In many cases, such proposals may result in a loss of character and amenity in the

immediate vicinity of a proposal, particularly that of adjoining residential properties. In general, it will be more acceptable for new planned development off a single vehicular access of adequate size, to be built on backland than a series of unrelated and ad hoc single proposals. Significant impact upon the overall character of the settlement can also arise from such proposals.

1.20 One form of backland development which requires the most careful treatment is known as tandem development. This is where a separate new dwelling is proposed in the back garden of an existing curtilage, either sharing an existing access or proposing a new access alongside the existing dwelling. There will normally be a presumption against such development. It usually results in a great reduction in the amenity of the original dwelling through overlooking and general nuisance, particularly nuisance from vehicular traffic. If such development is allowed to accumulate it can lead to a proliferation of new vehicular accesses to the detriment of road safety through increasing vehicle conflict and increased danger to pedestrians.

1.20a This form of development is often detrimental to the visual appearance of the street scene as it may result in the loss of hedges, trees, walls etc and to a loss of valuable open space and landscape features. Though a single case may on its own merits be acceptable when judged against other considerations, such development may set a precedent for similar examples of which the cumulative effect would be unacceptable because of their effect on the amenity and character of the area. Proposals also need to be judged against policies STRAT 4 to STRAT 8 dealing with Windfall and Infill Housing and policy STRAT 9 which relates to the Phasing and Release of Housing Land.

2. The application also fails Strat 6 All proposals must be on previously developed land. This proposal is on land used as a garden and is therefore effectively green field site under current definition.

3. This application also fails policy D3 of the adopted Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan in that it does not provide sufficient car parking space appropriate for a new 4 bedroom house.

Policy D - 3 Parking Provision (New Housing)

New residential developments must provide the following minimum number of off street car parking spaces per dwelling:

1 or 2 bedrooms	2 spaces
3 or 4 bedrooms	3 spaces
5 or more bedrooms	4 spaces

Accessible communal car parking areas of an equivalent provision will be considered as an acceptable alternative in appropriate locations.

4. The Application also fails Policy D6 (a and b) of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy D - 6 Design of new development

New development, including infill development and residential extensions, should preserve and enhance the village of Nettleham by:

a) Recognising and reinforcing the district local character (as set out in the character assessment and the Village Design Statement) in relation to height, scale, density, spacing, layout orientation, features and materials of buildings.

b) Designing housing proposals to reflect existing residential densities in the locality of the scheme.

5. Please also note:-

A similar proposed development to the rear of 29 Lodge Lane REF 133135 was refused by WLDC in October 2015.

(2) 12 High Street

Mr S Waldron

Ref: 134305

Planning application for change of use from detached residential room to convert to studio dwelling

The Parish Council's Planning Liaison Committee made the following observations regarding this application:-

1. Car Parking space is defined as 2 however the access is through a heavily used pub car park. The car parking access shown is in fact 4-5 pub car parking spaces.

2. There has been some confusion with this and PA 134285 for 12 High Street, which is the building at the front of this property and which was previously converted from residential use into offices some years ago. There appears to be an issue regarding parking provision for both these properties. Care should be taken that the situation does not occur where parking for both sites is allocated on an overlapping basis.

The pub car park can get very congested and parking spills out onto a very busy main road. Additional parking on the main road could be considered as hazardous and so we are concerned about reduction of parking spaces for this popular pub if space is allocated from the pub car park area for the proposed residential developments.

3. The original building to be converted to a residential studio in this application was previously a small function room built some years ago and it is associated with the pub. The function room has no running water or foul water provision. We can find no detailed notes on how the services will be provided.

4. We note that the building did not previously need to meet residential building standards, and has, what looks like, a corrugated asbestos roof. Please ensure that prior to possible approval the structure is subjected to rigorous inspection to the latest building standards and where deficient it is not given approval until the upgrade is agreed.

(3) Longdales Park, Lodge Lane Mr T Barton Ref: 134171
Planning application for the location of temporary buildings on the site of the main club house for the storage of grounds maintenance equipment, extra furniture and playing kit
 The Parish Council's Planning Liaison Committee **objects** to this application.

Background:-

The Lincoln Rugby Club has used shipping containers for equipment and catering storage since the clubhouse opened on the site in 2013. For the past 3 years these containers have been in use without planning permission. The storage area involved represents some 20% of the floor area of the brick building, and so it is not insignificant.

The Parish Council opinion is as follows:

1. These containers make the site look like an industrial area and do not give the impression to visitors that the site is the home of Lincoln's premier amateur rugby club.
2. The addition of tree screening is not an answer to disguising the ugly appearance of the containers as the trees and shrubs will take many years to grow to a sufficiently substantial size to obscure these eyesores.
3. The containers have already been used for 3 years as unapproved temporary storage and should be replaced by appropriate permanent storage within a reasonable time scale.
4. Permission to continue use of these containers should be subject to strict time limit, sufficient to build permanent storage buildings for the club, and on no account should their use be extended for a period in excess of 2 years.
5. We object to the proposed removal of parking spaces reserved for the disabled, busses and cycles, without justification.

(4) 51 Sudbrooke Lane Mr & Mrs Graham Ref: 134464
Planning application for proposed two storey rear extension to dwelling

The Parish Council's Planning Liaison Committee made *no comment or objection to this application*.

It was unanimously **RESOLVED** to approve the above comments which would be submitted to WLDC.

(b) To note consents, refusals, withdrawals and appeals received

18 Greenfields Mr J Deaton Ref: 134350

Planning application for proposed dormer extension to front

28 Scothern Road Mr I Foyster Ref: 134294

Planning application to demolish existing garage and erect new brick garage

It was unanimously **RESOLVED** to adjourn the meeting at 5.50pm to await the arrival of Father Crossland. Father Crossland arrived at 6.00pm and the meeting reconvened.

**05/16. PRESENTATION BY FATHER RICHARD CROSSLAND FOR POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT
AT ALL SAINTS CHURCH**

The Chairman welcomed Father Richard Crossland to the meeting. Father Richard explained that they had been looking at the future of All Saints Church and its congregation and a five year plan was now in operation. Due to the diverse nature of the congregation and the uses, functions and events they wish to hold the current church layout is not fit for purpose as a growing church. They wish to provide a wider range of services which cannot be accommodated in the main body of the church which can be an imposing space initially and does not have any ancillary space. For example, the Methodist Chapel layout is better fit for purpose with meeting room, separate rooms, storage. They would like to change the space they already have with new underfloor heating, new lighting and new chairs which can be stacked. Father Richard stated that they had also acquired the grand piano from Edward King House in Lincoln which could be used for events. All the school children attend the church approximately seven times a year and they need to increase the capacity of the church. Other events which may be held would be community facilities and exhibitions.

In order to facilitate these proposals a second space had been agreed which would be located on the north and west side of the church. The size of the second space would be the same size as the church and hold 100+ people and would be two storeys on the tower side. Historic England had been and looked at the church. The proposed style of the new building would have a more architectural feeling and a contemporary version of the Old School with a shared atrium space, toilet facilities, kitchen and serving area of sufficient size to cater for events; office space for administrator; meeting room similar to the old Parish Office; choir room with piano and potential for children's choir; other community benefit space, youth activities and an interpretation/visitor centre which would contribute to the rest of the village. The new building would be separate from the Church by a glass covered walkway

To raise the profile of these plans and assist with fund-raising a new magazine – Tower & Beck - will be coming out soon. The anticipated cost of proposed building would be in the region of £1.6 million, however could be less. Funding is being sought from Heritage Lottery Fund. The church also has approx. £250,000 from the sale of the Old School. The Diocese would also fund £250,000 into the build.

An architect has been commissioned to look at suitable plans. No new graves have been placed to the north side of the church for over 100 years and the neighbouring property owners are not averse to the proposed development. Also a Feasibility Study was currently being compiled and issues on joining the buildings together were being considered. Public consultation would be undertaken in due course. Planning Permission and Listed Building consent would be required for the external proposals.

The tower to the church is in need of rood and stonework repairs and would cost £70,000. An application had been submitted to the Church Roof Fund and would hear in July 2016 if the application had been successful.

Father Richard was thanked for this informative presentation and was encouraged to keep the residents informed of the church proposals. It was refreshing to see the church improving itself.

The meeting closed at 6.35pm.