

**Minutes of the Cherry Willingham Planning Committee,
Held on Monday 28th June 2021 at 2pm**

Present: Cllr Bridgwood (Chairman), Cllr Lacy (Vice-Chair) Cllr Brylewski, Cllr Bates, Cllr Trahearn, Cllr Scott, Gill Shaw (Parish Clerk)

10 Members of the Public were in Attendance.

The meeting began with the Public Forum at 2pm.

The Chairman commenced the forum by giving a general background to the planning application to build 144 houses on the land to the north of Rudgard Avenue. He then read out the draft document that the Parish Council would be submitting to WLDC which covered most aspects that were of concern to the residents (copy attached). He confirmed that the remit of the Parish Council was to consider applications with regard to policies such as the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan.

The first member of the public spoke about concerns over properties/footpaths resulting in his property being overlooked. Further members of the public had concerns about the size, number and ability to turnaround lorries delivering to the shops and volume of lorries to the development, the damage to verges, flooding, allocated parking spaces and access to the development.

Thanks were also offered to the Committee for all their work in producing the report.

All members of the public left the meeting.

1) Welcome and to resolve to receive apologies and accept reasons for absence.

Cllr Houghton had sent her apologies (working).

It was **RESOLVED** to accept her reason for absence.

2) Members' disclosure of pecuniary interests.

None.

3) To receive notes of the last meeting held on 21st May 2021 and agree for them to be signed as a true record.

It was **RESOLVED** to accept the notes and they were duly signed as a true record.

4) To consider applications submitted for comment

a) Application Reference No: 143181 - Land between 19 and 21,23,25 High Street - variation of garage design.

No comments.

b) Application Reference No: 143193 - 25 Waterford Lane - single storey rear ext.

No comments.

c) Application Reference No: 143111 - 17 St. Johns Av - front ext and other alterations.

No comments.

d) Application Reference No: 143190 - 64 Lady Meers Road - two storey side ext and single storey rear ext.

It was noted that there was to be a sun terrace which may overlook adjoining properties.

e) Any other applications received

None

5) Application Reference No: 142874: 144 house on land to the north of Rudgard Avenue.

- **Update on the consultation with the developers**

Following a meeting on the 28th May between two councillors and the developers, a report had been prepared (copy attached).

- **Agree the document for submission to WLDC with the Parish Councils comments.**

It was **RESOLVED** to agree to the draft document with the correction of calculation/typing errors.

6) Any matter for report and notice of items to be included in the next agenda.

- An informal meeting was requested with the owners of Bleak Farm to discuss their future plans for the site.

ACTION: Clerk to write to the owners to ask for an update.

- Building was still being carried out on the listed property on the High Street.

ACTION: Clerk to contact the WLDC Enforcement officer.

7) To confirm the date of the next meeting - to be agreed.

Signed: Date:

Chairman of the Committee

**Informal Meeting between Cherry Willingham Parish Council and Taylor Lindsey
RE: Planning Application 142874 Land North of Rudgard Avenue Friday 28 May
2021**

In attendance: Cllr Trevor Bridgwood, Cllr Sharron Brylewski, Dan Race Development Director for Taylor Lindsey, Sonya Turner New Homes Sales Manager.

Background to the meeting.

This was an informal meeting between myself, Cllr Brylewski and Dan Taylor with the objective of building a relationship between the Parish Council and Taylor Lindsey, who are major landowner and developer in the village. Whilst the Rudgard application is the immediate issue I believe that it is in the best interests of the Parish Council to work with Taylor Lindsey in order to influence not only the current application but also future developments. As the landowner of the majority of the earmarked development sites in the village we have to accept that this will inevitably be a long term relationship. If handled positively and as a working partnership we will get the best outcome for the village.

Meeting.

The opening discussion was in respect of the current application. Dan commenced by stating and showing that the primary issue is the difference between the Local and Neighbourhood Plan development numbers and the number in the application. I maintained that it is the view of the Council that from the legal documents side the number should be as per the planning guidance. This will become the focus of the application and Taylor Lindsey fully expects the application to go to committee at West Lindsey on this point.

We then moved on to site access. As to be expected Taylor Lindsey are aware of potential issues in this respect and have already sought to mitigate it by purchasing the adjacent bungalow and drawing up improvements to the access road.

We also touched on the house types and number of bedrooms. I did not go through all the points that we will submit in our response because at this stage it is the number of dwellings that is the primary issue and I didn't want to allow Taylor Lindsey to use other points to get around the numbers issue.

Summary: Dan has taken on board that the primary issue is the discrepancy in the number of dwellings and is going to take this up with his fellow directors. He will respond with the outcome of his talks early next week. On the whole I believe that the meeting was beneficial to both sides and that whilst we remain at our original positions on that issue, we have started a conversation on the application and future development and will be able to build on that.

Trevor Bridgwood
Chairman Planning Committee

Application Reference No: 142874: 144 houses on land to the North of Rudgard Avenue.

Statement from Cherry Willingham Parish Council

The Parish Council acknowledges that the land in question is included in the 2017 local plan and would welcome development that is in line with both the Local Plan and the adopted Neighbourhood Plan. We would like to make the following points as we believe the proposal is not in accordance with either Plan.

- 1) The **Local Plan** (CL1179 page 119) and the **Neighbourhood plan** (Policy H1 p 17) state 40 dwellings as the indicative number for the site. The Neighbourhood Plan (policy H2 p24) states that allocated housing sites should be designed at densities to deliver the anticipated yields. The application is for 360% more dwellings than the indicative number and if granted would result in a very crowded site (0.011 ha/ dwelling, including road and green space, compared to the indicative 0.039 ha/dwelling derived from the Local Plan). The total would exceed the number of existing dwellings on Rudgard Ave, a larger site.

We appreciate that this application must be considered as it stands but note that if it were to set a precedent for similar density of development on allocated areas in the parish it could result in over 1300 additional dwellings on the other 2 allocated sites within the main village (rather than 333) and 126 in “Little `Cherry”, off Hawthorn Rd rather than 59.

The Parish Council has met with the applicant Taylor Lindsey to seek an explanation for the difference in numbers between the application and the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan. Taylor Lindsey states that the figures in the two plans are erroneous and that they unsuccessfully challenged them at the time. Both plans were scrutinised heavily at the time of development and if no changes were made as a result it is the Parish Council’s belief that attempting to do so through a planning application is not appropriate. If successful in revising the allocated number we are concerned that Taylor Lindsey could take the same

approach with the next phases of the development. If both had the same density as proposed for 142874 it could allow 806 dwellings on Thornton East (CL1181) rather than 200, and 539 on Rudgard East (CL4437) rather than 133. The total dwellings on the 3 sites would then be 1489 rather than the 373 in the Local Plan - an almost 400 % increase.

- 2) We cannot see that the density of development in Application 142874 will comply with **5.11.3 of the Local Plan or policy H1 of the Neighbourhood Plan** as it would not “make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the environment within which it is located”, it would not “have regard to its local context and would “impact negatively upon the amenity experienced by neighbours” (in this case the rest of the village). **Policy H1 3** specifically mentions the need for development proposals for CL1179 and the adjoining development sites should demonstrate a master planning approach to create a cohesive and sustainable development: we do not consider that the outline plan given for the 3 sites demonstrates such a master plan.

- 3) **Policy D1 Cherry Willingham Neighbourhood Plan : Design principles for Cherry Willingham - Parking and layout.**

Paragraph j) states “where developments are proposing on-street parking provision, this shall be incorporated into the layout of the development through clearly defined parking bays”; and paragraph k) states “where a development is proposing a complex or block development, consideration shall be given to the inclusion of visitor parking spaces to avoid unnecessary clutter and on-street parking.”

The proposed density means that parking space will be restricted, and it appears from the plan there is unlikely to be space for more than 1 vehicle per dwelling on each plot. Although the travel assessment document states the road beyond the 6.5m wide access for commercial vehicles to the business premises is 5.5m wide it seems probable from the outline plan that on road parking will cause congestion and restrict access to delivery and emergency vehicles. This is

already an issue in the village as can be seen in the contrast between the upper and lower ends of Ladymeers Road: the lower end is more densely developed and is much more congested.

4) **Policy H2 Cherry Willingham Neighbourhood Plan: Housing Type, Mix and Density.** Paragraph 1. states: “developments should deliver housing of a size, type and tenure appropriate to the site and locality.” Whilst this is only an outline application and does not identify specific house types the density of 0.011 ha/dwelling is even greater than that allowed for the Wesley Rd developments in the Local and Neighbourhood Plans (0.0215/ha and 0.00252/ha respectively). Many of the existing new properties in the “Little Cherry” area along Hawthorn Rd are terraced townhouse type dwellings (some 3 storey), which would be out of place on the site in question if they were to be proposed on the definitive plan.

5) Both the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan include the need for sustainability and the reduction of carbon emissions. Designing properties to be suitable for home working would help towards this and could reduce the traffic congestion issues mentioned in 12) below.

6) **Policy OS3 Cherry Willingham Neighbourhood Plan Policy: Footpaths and cycleways.**

Although the plan shows a footpath from the western end of the proposed development to Croft Lane we consider that in addition a parallel cycle path should be provided: this would be safer for pedestrians and would also reduce the risk for cyclists by providing an alternative route that avoids the Rudgard junction (see 12b) below). The application also fails to take advantage of the proximity of the application site and the two future development sites to the existing public footpath and cycle routes. **Paragraph 2 of OS3** states “Developments that propose improvements to the existing public footpaths between Cherry Willingham, “Little Cherry” and Fiskerton, shall be strongly

supported.” In its objectives the Neighbourhood Plan “seeks to encourage new connections to other areas of the Parish and neighbouring communities”,

- 7) **Policy H1(h) Cherry Willingham Neighbourhood Plan** promotes development that ...”avoids creating hard edges along any boundaries of the sites that face the open countryside”, **paragraph 4.3** supports housing development which ...”enhances the village setting”...and the design principles in **paragraph 15.9** advise that ...”more areas of structural woodland planting associated with new development could create closure”. There is a missed opportunity in the application to mitigate the hard edge of the application design by including a path connecting to the Fiskerton footpath within a landscaped strip along a new edge to the village, thereby avoiding the same hard edge as the existing Lady Meers development, which ends abruptly against open agricultural landscape.
- 8) Currently the village has a population age structure which is older than the average for the area. We are concerned that the proposed mix of dwelling types may not meet the need of the community to become more balanced demographically by providing an adequate number of larger dwellings. To allow development at this density would probably mean houses of such a size that they would only be suitable for very small family units. This might be OK as starter homes but could result in them being aimed at the retirement end of the market. Cherry already has a skewed demographic, and an even higher proportion of elderly residents would make for an unbalanced community and pressure on services other than education (which could be disadvantaged). There appears considerable demand for larger properties within the village: there have been a considerable number of property extensions by people who presumably wish to remain local but for whom there are few larger properties available.
- 9) The increase in population of the proposed development (331 according to the estimate by the Clinical Commissioning Group) would add to the pressure on local amenities.

- a) Although we appreciate the application must stand alone, we note that if all sites were to be developed at the density proposed for application 142874 the parish population could potentially increase by around 3,700, which would be likely to overwhelm village facilities and totally change its nature.

10) Policy OS1 Cherry Willingham Neighbourhood Plan : Provision of new Public Open Space and Neighbourhood Plan Policy OS2: Local Green Space

The application does not make any reference to general improvement of village amenities other than the green space at the NE corner (0.59ha).

- 11) There is no reference to social or affordable housing although we appreciate this may appear when detailed planning permission is sought.

- 12) We note that access in the application is a reserved matter for future consideration and approval. Nevertheless, we note that as the proposal stands the only access to the site is off Rudgard Avenue. Although the Travel Assessment states the first part of the access road will be 6.5m wide with a squared off junction to Rudgard Avenue (which is an improvement to the current arrangement) we are concerned that goods vehicles (including HGVs) may still need to back in or out of this as there is no turning space by the commercial premises . This would continue to pose a high risk of obstruction and potential danger to other road users. The proposed footpath from the new estate access road to Croft Lane might actually increase the danger as it is so close to the Co-op delivery area.

- a) This would be a particular issue during the construction stage. Could the site be accessed by the airfield using the existing hard surface tracks with an extension to the east end of the site?
- b) Although this would be partly ameliorated if sites B and C are developed with access to Ladymeers Road via Thornton Way and The Leys the combined volume of traffic from the 3 sites would seem likely to cause congestion on

- the Ladymeers/Church Lane junction and potentially on the narrow twisting lower end of Ladymeers Rd and its junction with Fiskerton Rd (which appears to be becoming increasingly busy since the completion of the bypass).
- c) These issues would be exacerbated by development of sites B and C at the same density as proposed in this application: several hundred extra cars could potentially be attempting to exit or enter the developments over fairly short time periods.

13) Policy E1 Cherry Willingham Neighbourhood Plan: Enabling Employment

Opportunities: The application makes no contribution to this policy. The location of the application site would lend itself to the incorporation of extended employment opportunities behind the Village Centre. In line with **Policy R1: Village Centre**

14) Section 19 Cherry Willingham Neighbourhood Plan – Community Priorities

As already stated the land is identified for development in both the current development plans. The Parish Council would welcome the associated CIL that development would provide. However, the current application is more likely to compound the problems identified under Community Priorities especially **Community Priority 2: Traffic management measures**, to such an extent that any CIL would be required to mitigate the issues caused by the development rather than enhance the village.

15) Optima Transport Assessment – Provided by Taylor Lindsey in support of the Application:

- a) The summary of the assessment states in paragraph 7.1.8 that in regard to the proposal for 144 dwellings “Trips at the Croft Road/Church Lane/High Street junction will slightly exceed the 30 two-way trip threshold however the majority of additional trips will occur on the through flow, which will not result in either a material or severe impact on the junction performance. Despite this we remain concerned that this could prove a bottleneck.

- b) We also note that there is no analysis of the possible impact on the Church Lane/Fiskerton Rd and Waterford Lane/Fiskerton Rd junctions, where Lincoln bound traffic has to turn right onto a road which appears to have become increasingly busy since the bypass was completed.
- c) We believe that as the current application is submitted as phase 1 of the total identified development area the Transport assessment and Travel Plan should consider the site as a whole rather than just the first phase. As such we consider the resulting conclusions to be flawed.

Conclusion

In summary the Parish Council is disappointed that the applicant, who has a long-standing relationship with the village has unfortunately failed to take advantage of the hard work done by the Parish Council to produce the Cherry Willingham Neighbourhood Plan, which on its adoption was commended by WLDC for its quality and thoroughness.

We wish to oppose the application for outline planning permission as it stands but would welcome a resubmission that relates much more closely to that described in the Local and Neighbourhood Plans. We would like to take this opportunity to refer the applicant to section 15 and **Policy D1** of the Neighbourhood Plan: **Design principles for Cherry Willingham**.

The Council also consider that as the first significant development since the newly adopted Neighbourhood Plan, the application is a test of whether all the effort put in by the community will turn out to have been worthwhile. If the current application were to be approved against the Local and Neighbourhood plans there could be a loss of trust in the whole process of planning and development.