

**Present:** Councillor Bob Bushell (*in the Chair*),  
Councillor Biff Bean, Councillor Chris Burke, Councillor  
Liz Bushell, Councillor Gary Hewson, Councillor  
Rebecca Longbottom, Councillor Bill Mara, Councillor  
Mark Storer, Councillor Edmund Strengiel and Councillor  
Calum Watt

**Apologies for Absence:** Councillor Naomi Tweddle

**78. Confirmation of Minutes**

**(a) 12 January 2022**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2022 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a true record.

**(b) 26 January 2022**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2022 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a true record.

**(c) 23 February 2022**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2022 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a true record.

**79. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Edmund Strengiel made a Declaration of Predetermination with regard to the agenda item titled 'Blue Lagoon, Farrington Crescent, Lincoln'. Reason: He had been in various discussions over the years regarding the subject of this planning application and considered that his views were predetermined.

He left the room during the consideration of this item and took no part in the deliberations or vote on the matter to be determined.

Councillor Gary Hewson declared a Personal and Pecuniary Interest with regard to the agenda item titled 'Former William Sinclair Holdings Site, Firth Road, Lincoln'.

Reason: He knew well one of the objectors to the application for proposed development.

He left the room during the consideration of this item and took no part in the deliberations or vote on the matter to be determined.

Councillor Gary Hewson declared a Personal Interest with regard to the agenda item titled 'Land at Derwent Street, Lincoln'.

Reason: He served as a member on the Upper Witham Drainage Board.

He had duly considered whether this interest was a pecuniary interest under the member code of conduct. When taking into consideration the reasonable member of the public test, as outlined in the code of conduct, and the assessment of how much this application would affect the Drainage Board, he did not consider that his interest was a pecuniary interest. He would therefore be participating in the meeting as a member of the Committee.

Councillor Rebecca Longbottom declared a Personal Interest with regard to the agenda item titled 'Land at Derwent Street, Lincoln'.

Reason: She served as a member on the Upper Witham Drainage Board.

She had duly considered whether this interest was a pecuniary interest under the member code of conduct. When taking into consideration the reasonable member of the public test, as outlined in the code of conduct, and the assessment of how much this application would affect the Drainage Board, she did not consider that her interest was a pecuniary interest. She would therefore be participating in the meeting as a member of the Committee.

Councillor Rebecca Longbottom declared a Personal Interest with regard to the agenda item titled 'Former William Sinclair Holdings Site, Firth Road, Lincoln'.

Reason: She served as a member on the Upper Witham Drainage Board.

She had duly considered whether this interest was a pecuniary interest under the member code of conduct. When taking into consideration the reasonable member of the public test, as outlined in the code of conduct, and the assessment of how much this application would affect the Drainage Board, she did not consider that her interest was a pecuniary interest. She would therefore be participating in the meeting as a member of the Committee.

## **80. Member Statements**

In the interests of transparency:

- Councillor Bob Bushell wished it to be recorded in relation to Item No 5 (f) of the agenda, *Hartsholme Country Park, Dam Wall*, that Hartsholme Country Park came within his role as Portfolio Holder for Remarkable Place, however, he had not received any updates on the proposed works and had no personal interest in the matter.
- Councillor Bean wished it to be recorded that he was a member of Hartsholme Park Advisory Group.

## **81. Update Sheet**

An update sheet was circulated in advance of the meeting, which included:

- Additional responses and visuals received in respect of agenda Item No 5b - Former William Sinclair Holdings Site, Firth Road, Lincoln. 2021/0817/HYB.
- Additional responses received, including photographs, and a copy of the tree report prepared by the City of Lincoln Council Arboricultural Officer in respect of agenda Item No 5(g) – Blue Lagoon, Farrington Crescent, Lincoln. 2021/0175/TRC
- Visual photographs in relation to Agenda Item No 5 (d) and 5(e) (*LBC*) – 5 Christs Hospital Terrace, Lincoln. 2022/0057/HOU and 2022/0058/LBC

RESOLVED that the update sheet be received by the Planning Committee.

## **82. Work to Trees in City Council Ownership**

Dave Walker, Arboricultural Officer:

- a. advised the Committee of the reasons for proposed works to trees in the City Council's ownership and sought consent to progress the works identified, as detailed at Appendix A of his report
- b. highlighted that the list did not represent all the work undertaken to Council trees, it represented all the instances where a tree was either identified for removal, or where a tree enjoyed some element of protection under planning legislation, and thus formal consent was required
- c. explained that ward councillors had been notified of the proposed works.

RESOLVED that the tree works set out in the schedules appended to the report be approved.

**83. Change to Order of Business**

RESOLVED that the order of business be amended to allow the applications for development at Blue Lagoon, Farrington Crescent, Lincoln and Land at Derwent Street, Lincoln to be considered as the next two agenda items respectively.

**84. Applications for Development**  
**85. Blue Lagoon, Farrington Crescent, Lincoln**

*(Councillor Strengiel left the room during the consideration of this item having declared a predetermined interest in the matter to be decided. He took no part in the discussion or vote on the planning application)*

The Planning Team Leader:

- a. advised that permission was sought for demolition of trees/tree works; itemised within the Arboricultural Officer's and Planning Officer's report at the Blue Lagoon, a lake situated off Farrington Crescent to the south-west of Lincoln
- b. reported that the site had been designated as an amenity space when the area was developed for housing in the 1970's, having two planning conditions imposed requiring consent to be obtained from the City Council prior to carrying out any work to the remaining trees on the site and the retention of the largest lake the Blue Lagoon as an amenity area
- c. highlighted that the lake was surrounded by narrow banks containing mostly self-set indigenous tree species and dense undergrowth, the tree cover remained very dense around the lake with some trees being suppressed
- d. reported that local residents had reported issues at the site
- e. reported that only the trees were protected by the planning condition
- f. confirmed that the site had been in private ownership since the completion of the development, however, the land remained open for public benefit and was used frequently by local residents
- g. reported that numerous properties backed onto the area and benefitted from the view it provided

- h. reported that the lake seemed to have been used as a small-scale private fishing venue since the 1970's
- i. advised that the new owner received a grant in 2020 for improvement works and had started carrying out the work including pruning and felling of trees without planning consent
- j. informed members that the site had been inspected by the Enforcement Officer and the Arboricultural Officer, who concluded that he would have been unlikely to agree the works as they were not up to British Standards, therefore, the owner was advised not to carry out further work, which was complied with immediately
- k. highlighted that the owner wished to continue to manage the area for the benefit of the lake and to submit a request for further works to be carried out with the City Council's consent; the landowner was very apologetic when notified a breach had occurred and explained that works had proceeded on account of a misunderstanding around whether the trees were protected
- l. advised that although there was no formal consultation process for this type of application, local residents had submitted objections to the Enforcement Officer on the work carried out without consent, impact on wildlife and the use of the area as a fishing venue
- m. confirmed that the planning application before Committee included the Arboricultural Officer's assessment of the site and requested further proposed works to trees and details of work already completed in breach of previous planning consent
- n. advised that officers were of the view that not all of the proposed works were appropriate or necessary, and also did not propose that retrospective approval be given to the unauthorised work as it was not likely it would have received consent in its original format
- o. concluded that:
  - The owner had submitted a 10-year plan for the site and now fully understood his obligations in relation to the planning conditions and the need to apply for the City Council's consent prior to undertaking any future works.
  - It was not considered that any of the proposed works would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the lake, as required to be preserved by the planning condition, nor was it considered that there would be any detriment to the amenity of the area by permitting further works to be carried out to the remaining trees.

The Committee discussed the content of the report in further detail.

The Arboricultural Officer/Enforcement Officer responded to questions from members in relation to the planning application as follows:

- Question: Was the Arboricultural Officer happy with the officer recommendation?

- Response: Yes the report he had submitted was in the best interest of the trees on site'
- Question: The applicant wasn't being asked to replace those trees felled without permission?
- Response: It was no benefit to request the applicant to request retrospective planning permission. The Management Plan would allow all works to be monitored, with any additional works requiring Council consent.
- Question: Would there be any benefit from the trees being replaced?
- Response: Management of the site had been restricted over the last 10-20 years. A lot of the trees removed may be of benefit to the site in terms of biodiversity and the overall appearance of the area. Natural regeneration was of ecological benefit.

The Chair thanked local residents for highlighting the issues. This was a valuable amenity space. It was unfortunate that unauthorised tree work had taken place and had not been suitably dealt with, however, he believed officers now held a 'trigger' response over any future works.

RESOLVED that the application be split:

That partial consent be granted to carry out certain works as detailed in the extract below from the City Council's tree report and that consent be refused for those works identified by the City Council's Arboricultural officer as not being appropriate.

T001 Goat willow x2 - Fell	approve
T002 Silver Birch- Fell	approve
T003 Silver Birch- Fell	approve
T004 Silver Birch- Fell	refuse
T005 Sycamore- Fell	approve
T005.1 Oak- Crown lift to 3m	approve
T006 Oak- Crown lift to 5.2m	approve
T007 Silver Birch- Fell	approve
T008 Goat willow- Coppice	approve
T009 Silver Birch- Fell	approve
T010 Silver Birch- Fell	refuse
T011 Silver Birch- Fell	refuse
T014 Goat willow- Coppice	approve
T015 Goat willow- Coppice	approve
T016 Oak- Reduce canopy back to suitable growth point over footpath	refuse
• T017 Oakx2- Crown lift to 5.2m for highway clearance	approve

#### Additional works

T018 Goat Willow- Coppice for highway clearance      approve

#### Retrospective works

Various tree species- Silver Birch, Willow. - Fell (Removing no more than 5m<sup>3</sup> of timber) no replacements required

## Standard Conditions

- 01) The approved works must be carried out within two years of the date of this letter, any additional works, repeat works or works beyond this date will require a new application. All works must comply with British Standard BS3998:2010 Tree work - Recommendations.

### 86. Land at Derwent Street, Lincoln

*(Councillor Strengiel re-joined the meeting)*

The Assistant Director for Planning:

- a. advised that the application sought Outline planning permission for the principle of residential development for a parcel of land on Derwent Street, currently occupied by 18 single storey lock-up garages, with permission sought for up to 4 dwellings
- b. described the application site at Derwent Street situated off Carholme Road, a one-way street characterised by two storey terrace properties
- c. highlighted that the application was brought to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Neil Murray
- d. provided details of the policies pertaining to the application, as follows:
  - Policy LP26: Design and Amenity
  - National Planning Policy Framework
- e. advised Planning Committee of the main issues to be considered as part of the application to assess the proposal with regards to:
  - Principle of the Development
  - Visual Amenity and Design
  - Impact on Neighbours
  - Technical Matters
- f. outlined the responses made to the consultation exercise
- g. concluded that:
  - The principle of developing this site for residential development would be acceptable.
  - The detailed design and technical matters would be considered at Reserved Matters stage, however sufficient information had been submitted at Outline to demonstrate that the site was capable of being developed.

The Committee considered the content of the report in further detail.

The following comments/questions emerged from discussions held:

- Comment: Availability of parking space was a planning consideration. Resident's parking had been introduced in the area due to serious

problems. It was of concern that the development would generate additional vehicles in an area that already had existing parking problems.

- Question: What was the officer's view on the reason why there had only been one public objection received to the proposal?
- Comment: Following a site visit it was noted that cars were parked both sides of the road. It was a very busy street. When the garages were demolished and replaced by housing there would be more on-street parking.
- Comment: The Highway Authority referred to one car parking space provided per dwelling, which was doubtful according to available space, however, the application before us this evening sought Outline planning permission, provision of car parking spaces could be dealt with at Reserved Matters stage.

The Assistant Director of Planning offered the following point of clarification to members:

- This application was Outline, the plan was indicative only, however it showed that four dwellings could be accommodated on the site. The detail of the application was to be dealt with at a later stage.
- Car parking was a material planning consideration; given the sustainable location, nature, and size of the site it was considered that one car parking space per unit could be achieved and was acceptable.

Councillor Burke requested that subject to grant of Outline planning permission this evening, a condition be imposed for the detailed application to be brought back to Planning Committee.

The Assistant Director of Planning highlighted that it was within the member's right to request that the application be called back to committee at Reserved Matters stage.

Councillor Burke suggested that it was in the Assistant Director's gift to bring the application back to committee.

The Assistant Director of Planning gave an assurance that the Reserved Matters application would be brought back to Planning Committee although it was not possible to impose this as a condition.

RESOLVED that the Outline planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

### **Conditions**

- The development hereby permitted shall be begun either within three years of the date of this permission
- The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the drawings
- Off street parking provision
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Surface water drainage

## **87. 10 - 11 Lindum Terrace, Lincoln**

The Assistant Director for Planning:

- a. described the application property, 10-11 Lindum Terrace as two detached three storey villas connected by a flat roof, brick extension, most recently occupied as a medical facility providing a centre for child adolescence services
- b. reported that the buildings had laid empty for over ten years and despite having suffered fire damage and being in a state of disrepair, were structurally sound
- c. added that an application for planning permission had been granted in 2018 for the re-development of the properties with neighbouring sites to form a new medical village (2016/1140/FUL), but permission was never implemented and had now lapsed
- d. described the location of the properties to the north of Lindum Terrace approximately 1m higher than the road, as detailed within the officer's report
- e. confirmed that the site was situated within the Lindum and Arboretum Conservation Area
- f. advised that planning permission was sought for partial demolition works and the erection of a 2½ storey rear extension and a glazed link extension to replace the existing brick link structure, together with refurbishment work, including replacement windows, doors and new rooflights
- g. reported that the extensions and associated refurbishment works would facilitate a change of use of the properties to 16no. two-bedroom and 4no. one-bedroom flats, including proposed alterations to the access from Lindum Terrace to create areas for parking
- h. confirmed that the proposals had been revised during the process of the application following extensive discussions between the agent, officers and the Principal Conservation Officer, resulting in the removal of a two-storey extension to the side and the scaling down of the rear extensions, reducing the overall number of units proposed from 33 to 20, together with revisions to their design to improve their appearance, impact on the Conservation Area and residential amenity
- i. added that all neighbours and statutory consultees had been re-consulted on the revised proposals
- j. provided details of the policies pertaining to the application, as follows:
  - Policy LP1: A Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
  - Policy LP2: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy
  - Policy LP9: Health and Wellbeing
  - Policy LP11: Affordable Housing
  - Policy LP12: Infrastructure to Support Growth
  - Policy LP13: Accessibility and Transport
  - Policy LP14: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk
  - Policy LP25: The Historic Environment
  - Policy LP26: Design and Amenity

- Policy LP37: Sub-Division and Multi-Occupation of Dwellings within Lincoln
  - National Planning Policy Framework
- k. advised Planning Committee of the main issues to be considered as part of the application to assess the proposal with regards to:
- Principle of Use
  - Developer Contributions
  - Visual Amenity and Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area
  - Residential Amenity
  - Access, Parking and Highway Matters
  - Trees
  - Archaeology
  - Surface Water and Drainage

l. outlined the responses made to the consultation exercise

m. concluded that:

- The conversion of the property to flats was acceptable in this location.
- The renovation and external works to the property were welcomed, which would enhance its historic character.
- The design and scale of the extensions were considered to be acceptable and would complement the original architectural style of the property and surroundings.
- The proposals would therefore also enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- Neither the use nor the external works would cause undue harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties, and the development would provide an appropriate level of amenity for future occupants.
- The site was in an accessible location, also providing cycle and car parking space.
- A S106 agreement would secure financial contributions towards delivering new and improving existing infrastructure.
- Matters relating to highways, trees, archaeology and surface and foul water drainage had been appropriately considered by officers and the relevant statutory consultees, and could be dealt with as required by condition.
- The proposals would therefore be in accordance with the requirements of CLLP Policies LP1, LP2, LP9, LP11, LP12, LP13, LP14, LP25, LP26 and LP37 as well as guidance within the NPPF.

Adam Wilson, agent for the proposed development, addressed Planning Committee in support of the application, making the following points:

- He thanked Members for allowing him the opportunity to speak.
- He acted as architect/developer for the project.
- It was an exciting prospect to be able to restore this building.
- The building next door had been demolished as unsafe following a fire.

- Security at the application site had been increased due to instances of anti-social behaviour and people accessing the building, therefore it was important to act now to avoid any further damage being sustained.
- Discussions had taken place at pre application stage and concerns raised by objectors had been taken into account in reaching the final proposal.
- The number of units had been reduced to 20 to accommodate 1 car parking space per household.
- Sustainable transport measures included vehicle recharge points and cycle storage facilities.
- The development was within easy walking distance of the Bailgate and shopping areas.
- Older people may choose to downsize property to move to this type of development, it being close to amenities and in a well-appointed area.
- Other revisions had been made to the design of the elevations and the window/door design simplified to give the appearance of a continuation to the existing building.
- He hoped members would support renovation of this traditional property.

The Committee discussed the content of the report in further detail.

The following comments/questions emerged.

- Comment: It was interesting to be told the future occupancy for the building and welcome news it was to be restored.
- Question: Was a condition required on grant of planning permission to ensure there were no bats present prior and during works?
- Comment: It was hoped the proposed additions to the existing property mirrored the original house with use of quality materials.
- Question: Was there a sustainable alternative to use of tarmac for the site as it created a surface run-off?
- Comment: The building was impressive and in need of renovation. It would definitely be of benefit to the area together with providing additional accommodation.
- Comment: The works were badly needed to bring the property back to use rather than wait for it to be vandalised further.
- Comment: An objection had been received regarding the limited size of the flats. Bringing older people into a small area may not necessarily be beneficial, it was important to take a balanced view.
- Comment: The proposed use of the property was appropriate; homes were desperately needed, and these were in such a nice area.

The Assistant Director of Planning offered the following point of clarification to members:

- In terms of bat protection, the report prepared back in 2016 for the site showed no evidence of bats present. There was a legal requirement under separate legislation for the developer to ensure there were no bats present prior and during construction work.
- Use of best quality materials would be strived for in such a traditional development as this in a Conservation Area. The Principal Conservation Officer possessed great skills and knowledge to achieve the best finished result.

- A Surface Water Drainage Management Strategy was required as a condition of grant of planning permission which would deal with drainage issues.
- The number of flats had been reduced from 33 to 20. The footprint was relatively unchanged. Most flats were of generous size. The floor area of the flats was acceptable when considered against Nationally Described Space Standard guidance. There would be no foreseeable compromise to residential amenity.

RESOLVED that the planning permission be approved subject to the following conditions with delegated authority granted to the Assistant Director of Planning to secure the financial contributions through a S106 agreement:

- Time limit of the permission
- Development in accordance with approved plans
- Samples of materials
- Details of windows, doors and other architectural detailing for the extensions
- Joinery details for replacement windows and doors in the existing building
- Finish of wall/replacement brick pier to widened access
- Surface water drainage management strategy
- Foul water drainage scheme
- Works in accordance with Arboricultural Method Statement and tree protection plan
- Electric vehicle charging scheme
- Hours of construction
- Reporting of any unexpected contamination

**88. Former William Sinclair Holdings Site, Firth Road, Lincoln**

*(Councillor Hewson left the room during the consideration of this item having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the matter to be decided. He took no part in the discussion or vote on the planning application)*

The Planning Team Leader:

- a. described the application site, located to the south west of the City Centre, currently vacant although previously hosted by a series of industrial buildings which had now been demolished, situated within a Regeneration Opportunity Area as identified in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CCLP) and within Flood Zone 3
- b. advised on the use of the surrounding area to the application site as follows:
  - Tritton Retail Park was located to the north-west of the site with an industrial estate to the north-east
  - The site was abutted by the River Witham on the eastern boundary with residential properties located beyond,
  - The southern boundary was defined by the Boultham Pump Drain with Coulson Road located beyond the southern side of the bank
  - Coulson Road was lined with residential properties on the southern side facing the application site.

- A gym and a row of terraced properties lined the western boundary on Waterloo Street, with their rear yards backing onto the site
- c. confirmed that vehicular access to the site was proposed via Firth Road to the north
- d. advised that planning permission was sought in Hybrid form with full details submitted for the eastern part of the site (Phase 1), proposing the erection of 22 buildings comprising 67 residential units including 40 C4 Houses in Multiplication (HiMO's) and 19 Sue Generis HMOs, and an additional building at the entrance to the site containing office accommodation at ground floor with 8 apartments over two floors above
- e. reported that the site offered 310 bedspaces within Phase 1; 16 of the units would be accessible and their layouts also complied with Building Regulations M4(3)
- f. referred to Phase 2 of the scheme presented in Outline form with only the details of the access being considered as part of the current application, other matters would be determined on subsequent reserved matters applications, however, an indicative layout had been submitted showing 276 bedspaces within Phase 2
- g. provided details of the policies pertaining to the application, as follows:
- Policy LP1: A Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
  - Policy LP2: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy
  - Policy LP9: Health and Wellbeing
  - Policy LP10: Meeting Accommodation Needs
  - Policy LP12: Infrastructure to Support Growth
  - Policy LP13: Accessibility and Transport
  - Policy LP14: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk
  - Policy LP16: Development of Land Affected by Contamination
  - Policy LP18: Climate Change and Low Carbon Living
  - Policy LP25: The Historic Environment
  - Policy LP26: Design and Amenity
  - Policy LP29: Protecting Lincoln's Setting and Character
  - Policy LP32: Lincoln's Universities and Colleges
  - Policy LP35: Lincoln's Regeneration and Opportunity Areas
  - National Planning Policy Framework
- h. advised Planning Committee of the main issues to be considered as part of the application to assess the proposal with regards to:
- Principle of Use
  - Objection from University/Student Demand
  - Developer Contributions
  - Visual Amenity
  - Energy
  - Impact on Residential Amenity
  - Traffic and Pedestrian Safety
  - Flood Risk and Drainage
  - Landscaping and Biodiversity Net Gain
  - Archaeology

- Contaminated Land
- i. outlined the responses made to the consultation exercise
  - j. referred to the Update Sheet which included additional responses received in respect of the proposed development and visuals of the proposed buildings
  - k. concluded that:
    - The development would relate well to the site and surroundings, particularly in relation to siting, height, scale, massing, and design.
    - Technical matters relating to highways, contamination and archaeology were to the satisfaction of the relevant consultees and could be further controlled as necessary by conditions.
    - The proposals would therefore be in accordance with the requirements of CLLP Policies and the NPPF.

*(Mr John Woodward and Ms Ravinder Uppal chose to share the 5 minute maximum time limit allocated to speak against the proposed development, having different concerns in relation to the scheme. They spoke for 2 ½ minutes each.)*

John Woodward addressed Planning Committee in objection to the application, making the following points:

- He thanked Members for allowing him the opportunity to speak.
- He wished to bring the Committee's attention to potential damage to the former Cannon's Glue Factory as a result of the development.
- This significant building of historical value stood next to the site.
- The factory was a perfect example of a 19<sup>th</sup> Century 'sweat shop' and of considerable interest to the history of Victorian industrial development in the centre of the city.
- It was built by Bernard Cannon who became Mayor of the Lincoln in 1880.
- His mother was related to the Cannon family who came here in 1923. Her diary described the working factory in detail on a visit to William Cannon (son of Bernard) in 1921.
- The factory was likely to have been involved in the supply of glue in World War 1 for manufacture of aeroplanes.
- The factory represented a brilliant example of a traditional historic building.

Ravinder Uppal, representing the University of Lincoln, addressed Planning Committee in objection to the application, making the following points:

- She thanked Members of Planning Committee for allowing her the opportunity to speak.
- She represented the University of Lincoln as planning agent.
- There was no further need for more student accommodation, there was enough stock available until 2030.
- A development should respect need in the area which this proposal did not take into account.
- The accommodation would be unaffordable for those on low incomes.
- Policy LP10 had not been adhered to.
- There were no other available sites in the City Centre now for this development, however there was already enough student stock.

- There would be an overconcentration of student accommodation in the local area.
- There were flood risk issues.
- The Sequential and Essential test criteria had not been met.
- The scheme was not sustainable.

Sarah Carr, representing the applicant, Ashcourt Group, addressed Planning Committee in support of the application, making the following points:

- She spoke on behalf of the applicant.
- The Managing Director and Sales Director of Ashcourt Group were also present this evening.
- There had been no objections to the proposals from statutory consultees.
- Benefits of the Scheme
- The proposal was based on a similar successful scheme built and operated by Ashcourt Group in Hull. There were other schemes in Durham, York and Leeds.
- The scheme proposed town houses for use by student social groups already formed during the first year of University.
- It included parking spaces on site for resident's use, open spaces and a site management office.
- Students preferred this type of living compared to shared households operating as HMO's.
- The scheme would relieve pressure on the city's housing stock for family occupation.
- Landscaping areas and garden space would be provided on site.
- CCTV would be installed on site and night time security provided from 7.00pm to 7.00am
- No fossil fuels would be used on site.
- Levels of insulation would exceed the new building regulations.
- Electric vehicle charging points would be included on site.
- Low energy design principles would be employed over the site.
- The proposed development used Brownfield site in an appropriate area.
- The scheme would be delivered by an established and experienced developer.
- She hoped members would be able to offer their support to the scheme.

The Committee discussed the content of the report in further detail.

The following comments emerged:

- The St Marks development had been approved unanimously in the past for 1300 beds.
- When was construction of further purpose-built student accommodation going to cease, if the current accommodation could not be filled why was it needed? However, this was no doubt a good planning application.
- When the University was built it was envisaged there would be 5 - 6,000 students, now there were 14,000.
- This was a thorough planning application with carbon neutral elements.
- Purpose built accommodation was better for students.
- It was important to impose rent controls on purpose-built accommodation to avoid students moving back into community housing as a cheaper alternative.

- Should the proposed accommodation become vacant it would be difficult to transform into residential properties.
- The site was further away from the City Centre than other student accommodation, residential homes would be a better option for the site.
- The success of the venture was not a material planning consideration.
- An increase in purpose-built student bed capacity drove prices down due to competition/market forces.
- The scheme was an excellent proposal, low carbon, having green space and was not a massively densely populated site. It would be available to all students whichever point they were in their studies. It would free up properties for family living.
- The development may have a positive impact on Cannons Factory if perhaps it was restored at a later date.

The following questions emerged:

- Did the pandemic impact on a surplus of student beds between 2021-August 2022?
- Would the buildings be able to be converted into family homes, and if so would a contribution be made towards education, playing fields and an element of affordable housing?
- Why had conditions suggested by Lincolnshire Police not been accounted for?
- Would the scheme aid the Article 4 directive to free up student accommodation for family homes in places such as the West End?
- How could we ensure those family homes freed up when students moved into purpose-built accommodation were not re let as HMO's?

The Planning Team Leader offered the following points of clarification to members:

- There were 14-16,000 students in the city, 8,000 in purpose-built accommodation and a considerable amount living elsewhere.
- Experience at a similar scheme in Hull built and run by the same developer had resulted in a significant number of properties having returned to family homes.
- Landlords would not leave properties empty as it would be too expensive. They would be sold on.
- The proposed accommodation was capable of being changed to residential family homes should the current proposed use be unsustainable.
- The site incorporated a great deal of open space and would be a pleasant place to live.
- Officers were not satisfied that the figures provided by the University on student bed availability were capable of being tested as accurate.
- Officers were happy that the proposed use was appropriate for this site which was identified in the Local Plan for accommodation.
- In terms of the conditions suggested by Lincolnshire Police, those that were material were capable of being conditioned should members be so minded to do so.

A motion was moved, seconded, voted upon and:

RESOLVED that, subject to planning permission being granted this evening, security measures suggested by Lincolnshire Police that were also material planning considerations be included as a condition of approved planning consent.

RESOLVED that the planning permission be approved subject to the following conditions with delegated authority granted to the Assistant Director of Planning to secure the financial contribution through a S106 agreement:

### **Conditions**

1. Development to commence within three years
2. Development to be in accordance with the submitted drawings
3. Materials to be submitted
4. Contaminated land
5. Archaeology
6. Highway's construction management plan
7. Noise mitigation measures to be implemented
8. Biodiversity management plan to be submitted
9. Landscaping details to be submitted
10. EV charging points to be submitted
11. Boundary treatments to be submitted
12. Travel Plan to be implemented
13. Flood Risk mitigation measures to be implemented
14. Levels on site to be in accordance with drawings
15. Construction hours to be between 7:30am – 6pm Mon to Fri and 7.30am – 1pm Saturdays
16. Restricted to students only
17. Details of reserved matters to be submitted
18. Security measures to be implemented.

### **89. 5 Christs Hospital Terrace, Lincoln**

*(Councillor Hewson re-joined the meeting.)*

*(Councillor Watt left the meeting early to attend a prior engagement.)*

The Planning Team Leader:

- a. reported that the application was brought before Committee at the request of Councillor Longbottom
- b. advised that planning permission was sought for this property at 5 Christ's Hospital Terrace, a three-storey house at the intersection of Steep Hill, Christ's Hospital Terrace, Michaelgate and Wordsworth Street, opposite The Harlequin; the gable of the application property faced Steep Hill, with a yard at basement level containing a single storey outbuilding to its immediate south
- c. confirmed that the application property was grade II listed; an associated listed building consent application was to be considered as the next item on tonight's agenda
- d. advised that planning permission was sought to extend the property into the yard, demolition of the single storey out-building, erection of a ground

floor structure to form a bedroom and above it, at first floor a part glazed building serving the main house as additional living space

- e. highlighted that the new structure would be constructed behind the existing wall and railings to the Steep Hill side of the yard, which would be retained
- f. reported that:
  - The visible parts of the extension would be fully glazed to the Steep Hill frontage with the face set back from the front of the existing house by approximately 650mm at the northern end of the extension.
  - The ground floor of the extension would all be within the existing basement yard, enclosed by the existing surrounding walls and not visible from outside the site
  - The first-floor southern wall of the extension was proposed as brickwork, matching that of the existing house.
  - The eastern elevation, enclosed from view by an existing boundary wall would also be wholly glazed.
  - The roof of the extension would be metal with a standing seam.
- g. provided details of the policies pertaining to the application, as follows:
  - National Planning Policy Framework
  - 16: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment
  - Central Lincolnshire Local Plan
  - Policy LP25: The Historic Environment;
  - Policy LP26: Design and Amenity Standards
  - Policy LP29: Protecting Lincoln's Setting and Character
- h. advised Planning Committee of the main issues to be considered as part of the application to assess the proposal with regards to:
  - The relationship of the proposal to planning policy
  - The impact of the proposal on the significance of the listed building and on the character and appearance of the conservation area
  - The impact on the amenity of adjacent residents
- i. outlined the responses made to the consultation exercise
- j. referred to the Update Sheet which included additional photographs in relation to the planning application
- k. concluded that the applicant had explored several options with their architect and officers of the Planning Authority to arrive at a form of development that was considered to be acceptable in this sensitive location, it represented a contemporary but also restrained addition to the area.

Melanie Whild addressed Planning Committee in support of the application, making the following points:

- She thanked members for allowing her the opportunity to speak.
- The proposals had already been described eloquently by officers.

- This was a significant site.
- The building felt like a book end to other properties.
- The extension would offer a sympathetic addition to the existing property.
- Views over the top of the property would be maintained.
- The extension would be built behind the existing wall and set back from the main elevation of the house to fit in with the area.
- The property was previously used as student accommodation and would be used as a family home.
- Traditional materials including reclaimed building supplies would be used to complement the existing building and area.
- Top quality materials would be used for the build.
- She hoped members would give her the opportunity to work with local planners to develop the property appropriately.

Members discussed the content of the report in further detail.

Members referred to objections received from a local resident raising concerns regarding aesthetics and Lincoln Civic Trust having raised concerns around use of large glass windows and asked whether condition 4 requiring details of window dressings to be submitted would address these issues.

Councillor Longbottom commented as follows:

- She had requested this planning application be considered by Planning Committee due to the sensitivity of the site involved.
- The proposals included removal of a brick shed. She questioned whether this outbuilding close and within the curtilage of a listed building had been given sufficient attention.
- The effect on the setting of a development discussed within the Local Plan spoke about protecting local views. The proposed extension would result in the view through the site being significantly altered.
- In summary, she had reservations on grounds of:
  - Demolition of a building
  - The extension did not 'add' to the build
  - It distracted from views in an important part of the city.

Other comments were made in respect of the significance of the outbuilding to be demolished, archaeology and whether the Civic Trust objection had been dealt with.

The Planning Team Leader offered the following points of clarification:

- The options for the build had been drawn up during discussions with planning officers and the Principal Conservation Officer.
- The glazing in the building was considered to be appropriate.
- The outbuilding was attached to the Listed Building. Officers had made a site inspection. It was considered that demolition would cause some harm, however the test in planning terms was whether this was substantial harm or not. Officers were of the opinion that together with the benefits of the extension the harm would be less than substantial and felt that the design for the build was appropriate.
- The quality of materials to be used was at the uppermost end of the market, including very high quality blinds.

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

**Conditions**

1. Development to commence within three years
2. Development in strict accordance with the approved drawings
3. No work to take place until a sample panel of all materials to be used has been prepared on site and has been approved.
4. Details of window dressing including colour to be submitted before those works are undertaken.

**90. 5 Christs Hospital Terrace, Lincoln (LBC)**

The Planning Team Leader:

- a. advised that this application for planning permission related to the three-storey property at 5 Christ's Hospital Terrace, a three-storey house at the intersection of Steep Hill. Christ's Hospital Terrace, Michaelgate and Wordsworth Street, opposite The Harlequin; the gable of the application property faced Steep Hill, with a yard at basement level containing a single storey outbuilding to its immediate south
- b. confirmed that the application property was grade II listed; and this application sought listed building consent for the property
- c. advised that it was proposed to extend the property into the yard, for the single storey out-building to be taken down, erection of a ground floor structure to form a bedroom and above it, at first floor a part glazed building serving the main house as additional living space
- d. highlighted that the new structure would be constructed behind the existing wall and railings to the Steep Hill side of the yard, which would be retained
- e. reported that:
  - The visible parts of the extension would be fully glazed to the Steep Hill frontage with the face set back from the front of the existing house by approximately 650mm at the northern end of the extension.
  - The ground floor of the extension would all be within the existing basement yard, enclosed by the existing surrounding walls and not visible from outside the site
  - The first floor southern wall of the extension was proposed as brickwork, matching that of the existing house.
  - The eastern elevation, enclosed from view by an existing boundary wall would also be wholly glazed.
  - The roof of the extension would be metal with a standing seam.
- f. provided details of the policies pertaining to the application, as follows:
  - National Planning Policy Framework
  - 16: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment
  - Central Lincolnshire Local Plan
  - Policy LP25: The Historic Environment;

- Policy LP26: Design and Amenity Standards
  - Policy LP29: Protecting Lincoln's Setting and Character
- g. advised Planning Committee of the main issue to be considered as that of the impact of the proposal upon the significance of the listed building
- h. outlined the responses made to the consultation exercise
- i. referred to the Update Sheet which included additional photographs in relation to the planning application
- j. concluded that:
- The detailed proposals for the extension had been carefully considered and would not cause harm to the significance of the existing listed building
  - The formation of new openings to join the extension to the existing house, were, when weighed in the balance, considered to be acceptable.

Members discussed the content of the report in further detail.

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted.

**91. Hartsholme Country Park Dam Wall , Hartsholme Park, Lincoln**

The Planning Team Leader:

- a. described the application site, Hartsholme Country Park, as a Grade II Listed Historic Park and Garden
- b. advised that the proposal related specifically to the existing dam wall and culverts located to the north of the lake, adjacent to Skellingthorpe Road, with works to the existing outfall culverts, concrete slab and surrounding walls to facilitate an increased capacity and improved safety for the existing reservoir
- c. provided details of the policies pertaining to the application, as follows:
- National Planning Policy Framework
  - Policy LP22: Green Wedges
  - Policy LP25: The Historic Environment;
  - Policy LP29: Protecting Lincoln's Setting and Character
- d. advised Planning Committee of the main issues to be considered as part of the application to assess the proposal with regards to:
- Accordance with National and Local Planning Policy
  - Impact on Visual Amenity and the Character or Setting of the Designated Heritage Asset as a Historic Park and Garden
  - Works to Trees
  - Ecological Impacts
- e. outlined the responses made to the consultation exercise

- f. concluded that the proposed works were essential to maintaining the safety of the lake, whilst preserving and protecting the character and setting of the Historic Park and Garden in accordance with policies LP22, LP25 and LP29 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

**Conditions**

- 01) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 02) With the exception of the detailed matters referred to by the conditions of this consent, the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the drawings listed within Table A below.

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans and in any other approved documents forming part of the application.

Reason: To ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the approved plans.

**Conditions to be discharged before commencement of works**

- 03) Prior to works commencing on site details of measures to protect the trees on site during construction shall be submitted to and approved by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented on site prior to works commencing on site and shall be retained until work has completed.

Reason: In order to protect the trees on the site from the development.

**Conditions to be discharged before use is implemented**

None.

**Conditions to be adhered to at all times**

None.

**Table A**

The above recommendation has been made in accordance with the submitted drawings identified below:

Drawing No.	Version	Drawing Type	Date Received
GSN-JBAU-00-00-DR-C-1001		Elevations - Proposed	19th January 2022
GSN-JBAU-00-00-		Elevations - Proposed	19th January 2022

DR-C-1003			
GSN-JBAU-00-00-DR-C-1002		Plans - Proposed	19th January 2022
GSN-JBAU-00-00-DR-C-1004		Plans - Proposed	19th January 2022

### **Informatives**

All bat species found in the U.K. are protected under the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

It is a criminal offence to kill, injure, capture or disturb a bat and to damage, destroy or obstruct access to a bat roost.

During all building renovation, demolition and extension works there is a very small risk of encountering bats which can occasionally be found roosting in unexpected locations. Contractors should be aware of the small residual risk of encountering bats and should be vigilant when working in roof spaces and removing roof tiles etc. If a bat should be discovered on site, then development works must halt, and a licensed ecologist and Natural England (0845 601 4523) contacted for advice on how to proceed. The Local Planning Authority should also be informed.