

AGENDA



For a meeting of the
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
to be held on
TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2010
at
1.00 PM
in the
COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, ST PETERS HILL, GRANTHAM
Beverly Agass, Chief Executive

Committee Members:	Councillor Bob Adams (Vice-Chairman), Councillor Michael Cook, Councillor Mike Exton, Councillor Mrs Joyce Gaffigan, Councillor Bryan Helyar, Councillor David Higgs, Councillor Trevor Holmes, Councillor Reginald Howard, Councillor Mrs Maureen Jalili, Councillor Sam Jalili, Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown, Councillor Albert Victor Kerr, Councillor Alan Parkin (Chairman), Councillor Trevor Scott, Councillor Mrs Judy Smith, Councillor Frank Turner and Councillor Avril Williams
Committee Support Officer:	Malcolm Hall Tel: 01476 406118

Members of the Committee are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business listed below.

- (1) LATE INFORMATION REPORT

**Development Control Committee
14 September 2010**

Additional Information

PG1 – S08/1231

Proposal: Outline permission for residential, community facilities, public open space, sports pitch, railway bridge, roads and ancillary works

Two letters received from objectors one requesting that the previous objections to the scheme should be still on record the second concerned with the impact upon the Barrowby Road with regard to traffic.

Also that the bridge should be provided before any building goes ahead and that the plans indicate a cycle/footpath link merging at Barrowby Road at a point where cyclists are asked to dismount because of footpath inadequacies.

Officer response as follows:

There was considerable public opposition to the scheme when it was considered a year ago and to ensure members are aware of the issues the reasons for objection were as follows:-

“A petition with 52 names attached has been submitted stating that they object but state no reasons. 78 letters have been received and the comments are paraphrased below:

- Malting Lane should not be used as an access to Poplar Farm because on the narrow bridge and would create congestion;
- The omission of a large supermarket will create further congestion at “pinch point” junctions at Asda and Dysart Road;
- We currently have one of the best views on the existing estate;
- Peregrine falcons visiting the garden and hunting in the back field;
- Like many of our neighbours, we are not presently overlooked – the proposed development will change this for the worst. It will destroy our view, overshadow us, reduce our quality of life and devalue our house substantially;
- The estate is already experiencing drainage problems. The existing drainage system and balancing pond barely copes now. The proposed development will cover massive tracts of land that presently act as a buffer for the rain water and springs. This will substantially increase the run-off from the area and most likely overwhelm the inadequate drainage;

- We are therefore highly concerned about the proximity of the proposed sports and play facilities to our area. It is highly likely this it will act as a magnet for anti-social behaviour – we speak from experience of this;
- The proposed road connecting our estate to Gonerby Hill Foot will at the very least add to the traffic through our presently quiet area. This will have an obvious effect on the standard of life for the present residents, not to mention the road safety concerns for those residents like ourselves with small children. Of equal concern is the fact that this proposed road is likely to attract heavy goods vehicles that presently have to negotiate the low bridge on Barrowby Road – bringing with it noise, vibration, pollution and obvious road safety issues;
- We moved away from an area where so-called ‘affordable housing’ was built next to private housing due to the negative effect this was having on our property value – E.g. burnt out cars, anti-social behaviour, car crime, burglary and constant police activity. We are therefore distressed to learn of the proposals to introduce ‘affordable housing’ to this estate – especially given ‘rumours’ that it may be situated adjacent to our house in the less desirable low-lying land close to the intercity main line;
- There is currently more than adequate shopping provision in the immediate area. Adding more shops may represent a small advantage for any new residents of the proposed development but like most of the proposal offers no real advantage to the existing residents;
- The location of the proposed new school is less than ideal. For one thing it will cause severe congestion to the main exit point of the estate, even before the increase of traffic caused by the proposed new road and new residents is taken into account. Furthermore locating a school on a major road(s) raises obvious safety concerns;
- The proposals have lots of talk about all the lovely things that are going to be done for the new residents. Unfortunately most of these seem to be to the severe detriment of us the existing residents;
- Grantham’s infrastructure is not ready for this, nor does it desire it!
- It is highly questionable that ‘infrastructure’ and ‘public utility facilities’ for this area could be developed sufficiently and adequately to provide for such a high intensity of community, i.e. 1,800 homes;
- The proposed ‘two access roads only’ (Pennine Way both ends), facility would be woefully inadequate and inappropriate as a total ‘link’ and ‘access’ facility. Not only would it be access to well over 2,000 homes but also we understand also act as an ‘inner ring or link’ road for North West Grantham, to include the diversion of HGV traffic from the Town centre A52 route. This would cause traffic flow difficulties at peak times at the roundabout junction with Barrowby Road and also at the proposed traffic light controlled junction with Gonerby Hill;
- We note that possibly a school, Medical Centre, shop and sports facilities may be provided on the development (creating an even greater traffic flow on the link/access road), for a community of 2,000 plus possibly another 2,000 already in the area. It is considered that many more facilities would be required that are not available within the area;

- Incorrect data in TA;
- Increased traffic causing additional congestion because existing roads unable to cope;
- Only Football fields being provided;
- Bar Hill model is not comparable to the proposal;
- Whilst cycle network expanded, no consideration has been given to what happens outside the estate;
- No account made for additional capacity for supermarkets, hospitals, town centre car parking and secondary education;
- Growth concentrates on housing and not on employment;
- Overlooking & Loss of Privacy;
- Pennine Way will become a “Rat Run”;
- Wildlife in the open fields should be preserved;
- The flood alleviation areas should not be built on;
- We request a fence is erected at the side of the footpath leading on to Barrowby Road;
- With a proposed bus stop near our house the increased pedestrian and cycle movements will reduce our privacy;
- The inclusion of shared ownership homes and two and three storey dwellings are not in line with the established estates and will be detrimental to the whole area and reduce property values;
- It is a proven fact that large housing estates lead to an increase in crime;
- The Pennine Way bridge should be built before any development;
- On street parking on the existing estate should be reduced;
- Dog fouling is incompatible with children’s play areas and should be stopped;
- Landscaping with trees should be required;
- The application should demonstrate that it is compatible with delivering a Sustainable Urban Extension on the wider site and the granting of permission for this application should not prejudice this objective;
- There should be no development until the Grantham bypass has been built;
- The housing density is too high;
- There is insufficient open space;
- Risk to public health from Moy Park because the noisiest activities are sited facing the development;
- Health and safety – inappropriate to expose residents of the development to the dangers of commercial traffic using Moy Park;
- Potential nuisance from Moy Park from emissions despite their best endeavours;
- Moy Park is a large employer and this development may place the jobs at risk of an estimated 1500 persons who are directly or indirectly employed by the company;
- Moy Park will produce this letter informing the Council of the risks if any planning applications are refused at our site because of the granting of residential development;
- The design is dominant and oppressive;

- Over 50 southern marsh orchids have recorded in the unique grasslands;
- Other fauna and bird species have been recorded in the hedgerows;
- More time should be given for consultation with existing allotment holders;
- Increased pedestrian routes will allow potential for more crime;
- Noise and smells will increase from the construction of houses and know of problems elsewhere in the town caused by cars congregating when children are dropped of and collected from school;
- The development will create flooding on Maltings Lane;
- Maltings Lane should not be used as an access point;
- Floodlighting at the sports facilities would be intrusive;
- Valuable agricultural land should not be lost;
- It is questionable that there are utility services available to serve the development;
- The two access points are inadequate;
- Care should be taken over boundary treatments;
- There are insufficient Police officers to patrol Grantham and 1800 house would add to the problems;
- Lincoln Hospital cannot cope with the number of patients now, additional housing would exacerbate problems;”

The site as members are aware has been allocated for several years and the major issues with regard to infrastructure considered then. The bridge is to be constructed when the 751st house is built to allow developers the additional funds from sales to generate funds.

NB1 - S10/0682

Proposal: Erection of sports hall (incorporating swimming, fitness suite, gym, classroom and terrace)

Additional Information

Stamford Town Council has responded to the additional 'alternative site access points' report.

14 letters have been received from local residents as a result of the additional consultation.

Information Received

The observations of Stamford Town Council are reproduced below;

"Cllr. D Nalson declared a Personal & Prejudicial Interest and took no part in the decision.

There is no objection to the Sports Hall and the Town Council Planning Committee were pleased that alternative access points have been considered. However, concerns remain over the safety issues in respect of the access and egress with some of the options.

Proposal A – Use of existing access road linking directly with Conduit Road – This option did not address the concern about the poor visibility splays on exiting from the sports facilities onto Conduit Road.

Proposal B – Use of the existing access point into site via Northfields Court from Conduit Rd / Emlyns Street junction via Stamford Tennis Club - This is considered an acceptable alternative option.

Proposal C – Create a new access point from Drift Road - This is also considered to be an acceptable option.

Proposal D – Use of existing access point from St. Paul's Street. – This option is not acceptable for the same concerns as proposal 'A' in respect of the poor visibility splays on exiting. It is considered that this alternative would also add to the traffic congestion problems on St. Pauls Road.

Whilst it is understood that concerns have tried to be addressed; it is still believed that the requirements of Policy EN1 (vi) in SKDC Local Plan have not been met”.

A summary of the observations from the 14 letters are reproduced below;

- Note that there have been a number of refusals on highway grounds for development utilising the Conduit Road/New Cross Road access. This access has also been deemed unacceptable by a Planning Inspector. Using this access point would be detrimental to highway safety and contrary to previous refusals.
- Note that should the Drift Road access point be used a number of mature trees, possibly subject of a preservation order, would need to be removed.
- The access from Drift Road need not be 7m wide. The width of the existing access from Conduit Road is only 4m wide.
- The need for a new carriageway to access the site would erode the green nature of the site as well as create disturbance to local residents from noise and light that may be generated. Wider use of the building/site could also raise security issues.
- Access from St Pauls Street is currently not great and an increase in its usage would be harmful to highway safety. However, does not feel that there would be a need to create a road to the sports hall as people could walk.
- Both access points on Conduit Road are unacceptable and should not be used for the scheme.
- Feel that inadequate reason was given as to the reason why the other three alternative access points (excluding the existing) have been dismissed.
- Should permission be granted a condition restricting the hours of opening should be added.
- Photo's submitted in support of the application show the parking situation at its best, not reflecting problems that exist in the area.

Officer Comment on Information Received

None.

Additional conditions to be added

None.

Changes to Recommendation:

None.

Proposal: Outline application for residential development and associated play areas, allotments and open space.

Summary of information received:

The Local Highway Authority has provided the following additional information in relation to the proposed access arrangements.

“I refer to recent discussions in respect of the Persimmon development and future proposals and have the following observations.

At the earlier stages of the proposals by Persimmon Homes, they provided numerous Transport Assessments to satisfy 'highways' that Godsey Lane could cope with the size of development they envisaged, and demonstrated that up to 300 dwellings could be served via a signalised junction coupled with a junction realignment without the need for further improvement in the foreseeable future.

In fact the junction design could be considered to be over-designed in order not to cut off the potential for future development in this sector of Market Deeping and to potentially accommodate for a link from Godsey Lane to Linchfield Road/Towngate East - aspirational perhaps, but relevant in consideration of the future. This junction was designed to accommodate such future flows. The width of the spine road running through phase 1 has also been designed with these flows in mind.

The information provided with the current deferred application brought together all the previous work to demonstrate that an additional 120+ dwellings can be adequately accommodated.

The traffic signals will be biased in favour of the main flow (Godsey Lane).

The primary concern of the local highway authority will always be safety of the highway user and yes, traffic signals will involve some delays over free-flow situations but will have the added benefit of reducing speeds.

I have considered the proposal to provide a vehicular link to Towngate East in this phase of the development, but would consider that as the current junction proposal has been deemed more than satisfactory in highway terms, there may be no substantial benefit in having this link.

In the first instance, I would be concerned with its proximity to the junction Towngate East/Industrial estate, Northfield Road.

There may of course be merit in such a link further eastwards should phased or 'piecemeal' development in that direction come forward.

However, with the current suggestion, a crossroads would be formed, or junction arrangement with such short stagger that could create confusion of movement between motorists, and motorists/pedestrians. The link via Northfield Road to the A16 roundabout is not entirely certain due to the alignment not only of that road, but also the number of legs to the A16 roundabout potentially causing future safety and capacity issues due to the volume of traffic on the A16.

The developer has already proposed a footway/cycleway link in this approximate location, connecting to Towngate East that provides for residents to use alternative modes of transport to access the main area of employment in Market Deeping. This can be utilised as an access for emergency services. In addition, a sum of money has been agreed to be provided to enable a footway on the south side of Towngate East towards the Health Centre and the Godsey Lane roundabout from this connection.

This I would consider to be the preferred option.”

Officer’s comments on information:

Based on the above comments it is considered that the proposed junction has been over-designed to ensure that it can more than accommodate the proposed development and possible future expansion. The traffic lights can be phased in order to favour traffic on Godsey Lane to ensure that traffic does not backup to the mini-roundabout and an emergency access can be provided via the proposed footpath and cycle link on to Towngate East.

It is therefore considered that the proposed access arrangements are acceptable.

Changes to recommendation:

Approve as per recommendation.

Proposal: Erection of 20 affordable dwellings and infrastructure.

Summary of information received:

One additional letter of objection has been received from a local resident. All of the concerns raised are dealt with in the main committee report.

The developer has also submitted a Development Appraisal for the Site. The submitted appraisal shows the scheme with HCA grant and without. The appraisal only takes into account the S106 contribution for the Highways crossing (£20,000) and does not include the contributions towards traffic calming investigation, open space provision and education.

Officer's comments on information:

There is a typographical error on the top of page 40 of the report the first sentence states "The application site comprises a rectangular shaped area of land situated on the east of Bourne Road..." it should state "...the west of Bourne Road..."

The submitted development appraisal indicates that the developers would make a 6% profit on the proposed development and this is considered reasonable for an affordable housing scheme.

Based on the submitted appraisal it is clear that without grant funding the development would not be viable. The appraisal demonstrates that any requests for additional S106 contributions would appear to make the scheme unviable. It is therefore necessary for Members to weigh up the need to meet the affordable housing needs for the area against the potential additional impacts that the development would have on the local open play space provision and education facilities if the requested additional contributions are not requested (£10,000 towards open space and £33,983 towards education facilities).

If Members are minded to allow a reduction in the Section 106 contributions sought it is recommended that the additional £3,000 towards investigating traffic calming measures in the village should still be sought as occupiers of the development will need to cross the busy A15 and a reduction in the speed limit as well as a pedestrian crossing would help to further minimise any potential highway safety risk.

Changes to recommendation:

Approve subject to a reduced S106 contribution if Members consider this to be appropriate and subject to the receipt of amended plans which show individual house types for plots 1-4 and 14 and 15.

KJC1 – S10/1040

Proposal: Erection of 2 single storey dwellings.

Information Received

Anglian Water

No objection subject to an appropriate condition requiring a surface water/flood risk assessment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Acting Principal Conservation Officer

It is proposed to erect two single storey dwellings within the curtilage of no. 6, School Lane, a grade II listed building dating in part from the seventeenth century.

The submitted drawings show the proposed dwellings to be located in positions and to be of a scale and design appropriate for the context.

In my opinion the development, as proposed, would not have an adverse impact on the setting of the listed building.

If planning permission is to be granted I would suggest that conditions be imposed requiring the submission of samples of materials for both the buildings themselves and the external surfaces to the front of the buildings and large scale joinery details.

Alterations to Conditions

None

Changes to Recommendation:

No changes to the recommendation contained in the main report.

IVW2 – S10/0256

Proposal: Use of Marston Hall for civil weddings, entertainment receptions, guided tours, conference and use of adjacent land for event car parking.

Secretary for Parochial Church Council of St. Mary Marston objecting on the grounds of :-

- Impact of increased traffic and noise upon the tranquility of the churchyard to those visiting the church and paying respects
- Likewise potential for disruption when funerals are taking place
- The proposed track could cause similar distress