

Cadney Cum Howsham Parish Council Meeting Minutes

Minutes of the Extraordinary meeting held on 9th of July / 19:15 / Cadney Parish Hall

Parish Clerk – James Truepenny

Email – clerk@cadneycumhowsham.org.uk Tel 0791920551

<http://www.CadneycumHowsham.org.uk>

In attendance

Chairperson, Cllr. P. Heath, Cllr. P. Hart, Cllr. N. James, Cllr. F Leahy, & Cllr. D. Hackney,

Apologies

None

2507/01 **Declarations of Interest**

None recorded.

2507/02 **Planning**

- a) Planning Application PA/2025/721 consultation Prior approval Part 3 Class Q: Agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses at Cotswold Farm, Cadney Road, Howsham, Market Rasen, LN7 6LA

After a long discussion the council decided that the application did need prior approval for the following reasons:

The North Lincolnshire Local Plan seeks to strictly control development within the countryside to schemes which are essential to the rural economy or social well being of the area. As such this requires an application to be scrutinised.

We feel this application would raise the concerns we will list below and these points support our argument for the requirement of prior approval. Prior approval in order to consider the following:

Prior approval in order to consider the following: There is no Geoenvironmental report on this application and assumptions can not be made that there is no asbestos on site and the council believe that this needs testing as it will have a negative impact on both workers and residents should asbestos be present and would then need removing. There is an established hedge to the west of the proposed site close to the proposed buildings, and it should be considered in any development. If the applicant is just developing the building then there needs to be an assurance that local wildlife will be protected.

Prior approval in order to consider the following: The council has serious concerns about infrastructure, the access road to the site being very narrow and in poor condition, and the increase in traffic during and after the project's completion. There were concerns about there only being one access point on to a road that is unsuitable for the volume of traffic and exiting through the village at a junction which is already very dangerous. There are no footpaths to the site from the main part of the village. After the build there will be an increase in transport on Cadney &

Brigg Road which is already subsiding and a danger to drivers. There is a concern about the increase in deliveries as outlined in the design statement that would also put extra stress on the road system. It is not clear whether there is enough parking space for the potential vehicle numbers, it is not practical to park on the road near the site as the road is too narrow. The suggestion that residents will use Carr Lane rather than Cadney Road is unrealistic and unenforceable considering the state of the road.

Prior approval in order to consider the following: The Council is also concerned about the runoff and large volume of waste water from the proposed properties when there is already a flooding issue with properties nearby. There are concerns about the integrity of the pond which is in fact a disused slurry pit, which in the original advertising of the property was described as a "Slurry Lagoon.". The site is also largely built on clay and will therefore have issues with drainage. The area is in a dip. There is the modest risk of flooding in the field next to the site and north of the pond.

Prior approval in order to consider the following: There is currently little or no lighting on the area of the proposed development and therefore there would be a negative impact on nocturnal animals due to light pollution after the build. It would also have an impact on wildlife during the day. Whilst the sites being developed there are concerns of the increase in noise.

Prior approval in order to consider the following: Carr Lane and Cadney Road are narrow, both of them are single track lanes, one of which is subsiding in places, and they clearly would not support work traffic for the project in the first place. Works traffic could also only access through Cadney Road, Howsham due to weight restrictions via Cadney. Carr Lane (referred to as unnamed in the application) would be impractical for heavy traffic as it is a farm track. None of the mitigations offered outweigh the massive negative impact that the development will have on the village. There is a 60mph limit on that stretch of road which is dangerous when there is no path and no lighting for pedestrians. There is nowhere in the plans to say where any of the Refuse and Recycling Bins will be stored on site and there are concerns on the distance they will have to take on collection days. There are also concerns that the road is not suitable for Refuse Collection Vehicles. There is no path so there are concerns for the safety of workers and there is nowhere for such vehicles to turn around.

Prior approval in order to consider the following: We have queries and concerns about the application using the existing drainage system that is on site. Kelsey's Waste Management system is currently operating at full capacity. It seems like the building would be unlikely to accommodate and physically support seven dwellings and remain structural sound. The proposal will not incorporate substantial parts of the original structure and therefore, to all intents and purposes, will be a new build. We would expect that it would require new foundations and potentially a new floor which would take it outside the scope of Class Q. In order to conform to Class Q the existing building must in structural terms already be capable of functioning as a dwelling. No structural assessment has been provided.

Prior approval in order to consider the following: The North Lincolnshire Development Framework states that proposals should be located to minimise the need to travel and encourage journeys by walking, cycling and public transport. That would only leave Brigg as a reachable employment hub when the majority of job opportunities are further afield. There is limited public

transport to the village which would not provide a reliable service for regular commuting nor full access to nearest towns. While this application is for this area of the site, there is potential for the rest of the site to be used for other agricultural purposes which could have negative impact on residents.

The Planning application ask 'is site currently part of an established agricultural unit' and 'was the site part of an established agricultural unit on 24 July 2023' An established agricultural unit is defined as 'agricultural land occupied as a unit for the purposes of agriculture (and which was in use for that purpose on or before the relevant qualifying date under classes Q, R and S respectively)' - presumably 24th July 23 as per planning application questions?

Agriculture is exempt from business rates so unable to get a definitive definition as to what is occupied, however, based on commercial premises 'a building is classed as empty (unoccupied) if it isn't being used and stock and effects have been removed (apart from fixtures and fittings).

As per sales listing <https://www.onthemarket.com/details/10914966/> this was an unoccupied property back in October 21 and as per planning applications stating disused piggery - this doesn't comply with being an established unit on 24 July 2023. Therefore, believe that was unoccupied in July 23 and therefore not an established agricultural unit at that time and potentially does not meet requirements for class Q conversion

Re-build or conversion?

Hibbit and another v Secretary of state for communities and local government (1) and Rushcliffe Borough Council (2) (2016) EWHC 2853 (admin) - steel framed structure deemed as re-build

Other cases that substantiate rebuild:

APP/R3325/W/21/3282898 - Land OS 952 pat, West Coker Road, Yeovil, Somerset

APP/H1840/W/23/3333376 Briary House Farm, North Piddle Lane, North Piddle

APP/J1860/W/20/3249818 /barn at (SO 77827 655210, Hillhampton Farm, Great Whitley.

No structural/asbestos report - as per previous geoenvironmental assessment section 2.3 states that pig shed is a timber frame building with pitched cement roof - with cement sheeting possibly containing asbestos.

How much can be retained ?

Structurally able to sustain a building + additional floor (assuming permitted development?)

Can enough of the structure be retained to class as a re-build - no structural survey or details of what part of the structure are to be retained? Or is this a rebuild and falls outside of class Q?

Proposed Cllr Heath Seconded Cllr Mearns All in Favour

b) Planning Application PA/2025/749 at land to the West, Cadney Road, Cadney

After a discussion the council decided that this application does need prior approval for the following reasons.

The road to Cadney Bridge, Bridge Lane, requires a lot of support work before site traffic can access it.

There will be increased traffic through both villages when supplying the site. Access from Brigg will be difficult due to poor roads, tight turns and height restricting rail bridges. Especially for articulated vehicles.

Proposed Cllr Heath Seconded Cllr James 6 in Favour 1 Against

Meeting Closed 8:28