

# AGENDA



For a meeting of the
<b>DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE</b>
to be held on
<b>TUESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2013</b>
at
<b>1.00 PM</b>
<b>* PLEASE NOTE TIME OF MEETING *</b>
<b>(THE LATE REPORT WILL BE EMAILED TO MEMBERS ON THE FRIDAY BEFORE THE MEETING)</b>
in the
<b>COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, ST PETERS HILL, GRANTHAM</b>
<b>Beverly Agass, Chief Executive</b>

Committee Members:	Councillor Mark Ashberry, Councillor Michael Cook, Councillor David Higgs, Councillor Reginald Howard, Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown, Councillor Vic Kerr, Councillor Michael King, Councillor Charmaine Morgan, Councillor Alan Parkin, Councillor Helen Powell, Councillor Mrs Judy Smith, Councillor Jacky Smith (Vice-Chairman), Councillor Judy Stevens, Councillor Adam Stokes, Councillor Mrs Brenda Sumner, Councillor Martin Wilkins (Chairman) and Councillor Debbie Wren
Committee Support Officer:	Malcolm Hall Tel: 01476 406118

**(PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE WILL BE A COMFORT BREAK AT  
3.00PM FOR TEN MINUTES)**

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

- 1. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**(Enclosure)**

## **PUBLIC SPEAKING**

Anyone who would like to speak at the meeting should notify the Committee administrator one working day before the time of the meeting. The deadline by which you must notify us for the 2013/14 meetings are:

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Notification Deadline</b>
Tuesday 14 May, 1pm	Monday 13 May 2013, 1pm
Tuesday 4 June 2013, 1pm	Monday 3 June 2013, 1pm
Tuesday 25 June 2013, 1pm	Monday 24 June 2013, 1pm
Tuesday 16 July 2013, 1pm	Monday 15 July 2013, 1pm
Tuesday 6 August, 1pm	Monday 5 August 2013, 1pm
Tuesday 27 August 2013, 1pm	Friday 23 August 2013, 1pm Early due to Bank Holiday
Tuesday 17 September 2013, 1pm	Monday 16 September 2013, 1pm
Tuesday 8 October 2013, 1pm	Monday 7 October 2013, 1pm
Tuesday 29 October, 1pm	Monday 28 October 2013, 1pm
Tuesday 19 November 2013, 1pm	Monday 18 November 2013, 1pm
Tuesday 10 December 2013, 1pm	Monday 9 December 2013, 1pm
Tuesday 31 December 2013, 1pm	Monday 30 December 2013, 1pm
Tuesday 21 January 2014, 1pm	Monday 20 January 2014, 1pm
Tuesday 11 February 2014, 1pm	Monday 10 February 2014, 1pm
Tuesday 4 March 2014, 1pm	Monday 3 March 2014, 1pm
Tuesday 25 March 2014, 1pm	Monday 24 March 2014, 1pm
Tuesday 15 April 2014, 1pm	Monday 14 April 2014, 1pm

If you would like to include photographs or other information as part of your presentation to the Committee, please send the information in an electronic format (e-mail with attachments, memory stick or disc) to the relevant case officer at least one working day before the meeting. If you are submitting hard copy information, please send it to the relevant case officer at least two working days before the meeting.

All speakers are at the Committee Chairman's (or Vice-Chairman's) discretion. Each person is allowed to speak for 3 minutes. Members of the Council are allowed to speak for 5 minutes in accordance with Council Procedure Rules.

Only one speaker for the applicant or the town and parish council will be allowed to speak. If there are several supporters or objectors to an application, they are encouraged to appoint a representative to present a joint case.

Development Control Committee members are able to ask questions about speakers' presentations. There is a time limit of 10 minutes for each speaker.

## **ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS**

1. Short introductory presentation by the case officer
2. Speakers (Committee members will ask questions after each speaker)
  - a. District Councillors who are not Committee members
  - b. Representative from town/parish council
  - c. Objectors to an application
  - d. Supporters of an application
  - e. The applicant or agent for the applicant
3. Debate – Councillors will discuss the application and make proposals
4. Vote – the Committee will vote to agree its decision

**Development Control Committee  
24 September 2013**

**Additional Information**

JJ1 – S13/1824

**Proposal:** Section 73 application to vary wording of Condition 27 and 30 of S13/0260 (access improvements) Land west of Ryhall Road, Stamford

**Summary of information received:**

The following comments have been received from Voice of Stamford:

*"I wrote to you on 26th July 2013 with many attachments containing matters of acknowledged importance, setting out my objections to the proposed development.*

*I remain convinced that existing highway issues arising from the blind dips make this development unsafe with its intensification of user, so my 26th July objections still stand.*

*I now write additionally as you have advised that 'amended plans' are now available for the proposed construction access arrangement.*

*This is a bit of a puzzle, as no plans at all were put up on the SKDC website at the time of my 26th July objections.*

*So what I see on the SKDC website now are not amended plans, they are just plans.*

*Consent for S13/0260 to construct the development was conditioned for good reasons, and after long debate.*

*The applicants wish to amend these conditions should be refused*

*I wrote on 16th July 2013 to the agents for the applicant, requesting permission to enter the lands.*

*Permission was denied, the e-mail string is attached.*

*I conclude that the applicant has something to hide.*

*My understanding is that some 35,000 tonne of excavation waste will need to be removed from the site.*

*Stamford is subject to a 7.5 tonne weight limit, so will all vehicles carrying the spoil away have to turn north into Rutland?*

*I assume this excavation waste comprises topsoil, subsoil, and oolitic limestone ('Lincolnshire limestone')?*

*Are the destinations for each of these separate materials known, and what planning consents has been granted at the destinations?*

*Given that some quarries produce annually at this scale, why is this application not being dealt with by the County Council who have the appropriate competencies?*

*Or have SKDC sought professional advice from the County mineral planners  
The on-site excavation operations proposed may require the use of explosives, and will certainly require the use of heavy excavation machinery.  
Issues which immediately come to mind that may need conditioning include:*

*Scheme for a right turning lane on the highway*

*Scheme for soils stripping, handling, transport and storage*

*Scheme of working program, phasing and direction of working*

*Scheme for hours of working*

*Scheme for the control of lighting including floodlighting*

*Scheme for Community Liaison*

*Scheme for the avoidance of deleterious materials being carried onto the highway, including provision of a wheel wash*

*Scheme for the control of blasting, including air blast and ground movement recording*

*Scheme for the control of noise and noise monitoring*

*Scheme for the control of dust and dust monitoring*

*Scheme for ground water and surface water monitoring*

*Scheme for archaeological work, including recording*

*Scheme for geological work and recording*

*Scheme for security fencing.*

*The conceptual basis of this undertaking is unwise. It will be costly and difficult to excavate and remove elsewhere these quantities of excavation waste.*

*It will be next to impossible to avoid deleterious waste being deposited on the highway.*

*Would it be safer, better and perhaps less costly to use the said waste to build up the blind dips in the highway to eliminate said blind dips.*

*Then the highway could be re-made at the higher level, and be safe.*

*The reported injury accidents and the intensification of the user together with the existing blind dips in the highway should provide sufficient planning reasons for this application and its recently provided plan to be refused as indicated in my objections of 26th July. The additional issues which I have raised above reinforce my discomfort with this application, and provide additional planning reasons for refusal. The conditions on S13/0260 were correctly applied. This application S13/1824 should be refused. "*

**Officer's comments on information:**

This application is a Section 73 application to allow for construction traffic to access the site from an existing access located to the north of Borderville Farm. The applicant has advised that material will not be removed from the site but used in the re-contouring of the ground to provide a level site for the football pitches. A condition is however attached so that if material does need to be removed from the site precise details of where the material is going to be taken to and traffic routing details need to be provided to the Council.

Other issue relating to the proposed development were considered as part of the original application when considering application S13/0260. The applicant's agent has confirmed that there will be no blasting as part of the development.

With regard to "deleterious waste being deposited on the highway" a wheel washing facility is proposed to be constructed within the site.

**Changes to recommendation:**

None.

## NB1 – S13/1712

### **Additional Information**

Five additional letters have been received from local residents and further observations received from the Highway Authority.

**Proposal** Replacement dwelling (amendments to application S13/0728).

### **Information Received**

One letter fully supports the new access subject to the access shared with the Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) being permanently closed off.

The four other letters raise similar concerns to the application as previously outlined, namely;

- The new access has poor visibility because of protected trees in the locality;
- Vehicles passing over the tree roots may compromise the trees;
- The design of the dwelling is still in-appropriate, too tall and does not preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area;
- The dwelling is too large and 'not like for like';
- The replacement dwelling is oversized and would affect the setting of the adjacent Listed Building;
- Residential amenity will be compromised through an overlooking impact;

The Highway Authority does not object to the application as amended subject to condition 13 making it clear that both existing access points are closed off once the new one has been created.

### **Officer Comment on Information Received**

The issues raised are similar to previous concerns, and have already been considered. The alteration to the scheme is that the access point is to no longer be shared with the SAM, as well as existing access points closed. This alteration is considered to go far enough to overcome previous concerns highlighted by Members and the application is acceptable in all other regards.

### **Alterations to Conditions**

Amend condition 13 to that outlined below;

Within seven days of the replacement dwelling being occupied, the two existing accesses onto Castlegate shall be permanently closed in accordance with a scheme to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To reduce to a minimum the number of individual access points to the site, in the interests of road safety.

**Changes to Recommendation**

None. Grant permission subject to the imposition of conditions.

SP1 – S13/1872

**Proposal:** Provide pitched roof over single storey side extension and build rear extension

**Please note – Verbal report to be given at Development Control Committee.**

SP2 – S13/1873

**Proposal:** Provide pitched roof over single storey side extension and build rear extension (Listed Building Consent).

**Please note – Verbal report to be given at Development Control Committee.**