

## STAMFORD TOWN COUNCIL

### **MINUTES OF THE VIRTUAL EXTRA ORDINARY STAMFORD TOWN COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 05 JANUARY 2021 AT 5.00PM AT REMOTE LOCATIONS USING VIDEO AND AUDIO LINK (Occasional interruptions may have occurred during this meeting)**

**PRESENT** Councillor B Turner, Chairman (Town Mayor)  
Councillor Mrs G Johnson, Deputy Chairperson (Deputy Mayor)  
Councillor H Bisnauthsing  
Councillor M Exton  
Councillor B Sandall  
Councillor Mrs S J Sandall  
Councillor J Dawson  
Councillor Miss B Griffin  
Councillor Mrs S Sismore  
Councillor D Taylor  
Councillor A Croft  
Councillor S Carroll  
Councillor D Dorson  
Councillor Mrs M Pitt  
Councillor Mrs A Wheeler  
Councillor Mrs A Carter-Begbie  
Councillor Mrs E Hooper  
Councillor S Ford

**ALSO PRESENT** Town Clerk  
Deputy Town Clerk  
6 Members of public  
1 Members of Press

#### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:**

- *Resident* – Observed that there were insufficient reasons to object to the application for development of the former Cummins site. The following points were expressed:
  - i. This site needs to be developed, but will have an impact on the Town.
  - ii. Affordable housing is required in Stamford.
  - iii. The Master Plan is to provide housing on the portion of the greenfield site, owned by Burghley House Preservation Trust (BHPT), which currently has permission for business use only.
  - iv. A petition which attracted 200 signatures supports the East Meadows being permanently protected from any further development, and to be made fully accessible as a natural public amenity space before any development is granted on any adjacent land.
  - v. The Cummins site is poorly situated for access to schools and healthcare facilities,
  - vi. It is anticipated that there will be circa 500 residents which will include children and the elderly. There is a real concern over the unmanned railway crossing at the North East corner of the site.
  - vii. It is considered that SKDC has an obligation to ensure the best outcome is achieved for the Town.
  - viii. It was considered that there is an ethical issue as SKDC not only has a significant financial interest in the site but is also the Planning Authority which will be granting permission.

Formal meeting commenced 5.05pm

**359. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Point 2)**

Councillor Mrs J Clarke and Councillor S Fenn submitted their reasons for absence.

**Proposal 1** - Councillor S Ford proposed and seconded by Councillor B Sandall, the Council accepted the reasons for absence. This was unanimously **RESOLVED**.

**360. DECLARATION OF INTEREST (Agenda Point 3)**

Councillors M Exton and H Bisnauthsing declared a Personal Interest in respect of any discussions relating to planning application S20/2056 – Land North of Barnack Road, as they are on the SKDC Development Management Committee and consequently would be observers.

Councillor J Dawson declared a Personal Interest in respect of any discussion relating to the East Meadows as his son works for Strutt and Parkers who are agents for BHPT and would not be participating in the discussion or decision.

**361. To Consider Application S20/2056 – Land of Barnack Road (Agenda Point 4)**

The Chairman Councillor B Turner invited Councillor S Carroll, Chairman of the Town Council Planning Committee, to present the Committee's recommendation.

Councillor Carroll informed the Council that the Planning Committee had considered planning application S20/2056 and the majority supported the application. All members of the Council had been circulated with the list of observations which follow:

- *Traffic Movement* – The access and egress of traffic from the development site would create a bottleneck on Barnack Road.
- *Traffic Survey* – It had been observed that the traffic survey had been completed during the June lockdown so the data would be inaccurate.
- *Parking* – There are existing parking problems on Barnack Road. With the anticipated increase in traffic movements there is a fear that yellow lines could be introduced to mitigate any congestion, causing upheaval for residents in the locality who currently make use of on-street parking.
- *Pedestrian access* – It was considered that the creation of a pedestrian footpath access to the East Meadows would have benefits for residents. In addition, the proposed elevated cycle way could be considered as a shared facility with pedestrians making access to Stamford hospital and shops more attractive, thereby reducing potential car use.
- *Railway crossing* – Due to the close proximity of a hazardous, unmanned railway crossing to the site there is an essential requirement for measures to be put in place to mitigate the possibility of any accidents. (*Local Plan page 198 Policy ID2 Transport & Strategic Transport infrastructure*)
- *Impact on existing infrastructure* – It is considered that the proposed development will seriously impact the existing infrastructure and the Planning Authority should only grant permission if it can be demonstrated that there is, or will be, sufficient infrastructure capacity provided within an agreed timescale to support and meet all the requirements arising from the proposed development. (*Local Plan page 196 Policy ID1 Infrastructure for Growth*)
- *Flood Risk* – As the site has the potential for flooding, development should be in an area of minimal risk. (*Local Plan page 95 Policy EN5 Flood Risk*)
- *Climate Change* – There is question as to whether this development will be of minimum impact and contribute towards creating a strong, stable and more diverse economy. (*Local Plan page 46 Policy SD1 The Principles of Sustainable Development*)

- *Affordable Housing* – It is hoped that the development will meet the Local Plan Policy H2 provision that 30% of the scheme's total capacity be affordable housing. (*Local Plan page 61 Policy H2 Affordable Housing Contribution*)
- *Existing Employment Site* – Adequate protection is given to existing employment space to enable the Town to thrive. (*Local Plan page 81 Policy E3 Protecting Existing Employment sites*)
- *Ethical Issue* – There was concern over the fact that SKDC has a significant financial interest in this development and that it is also the Planning Authority.

Discussion ensued and Councillor D Taylor understood that under Planning Law SKDC has the authority to oversee the proposed development and grant planning permission to itself. However, he anticipated that the application would receive rigorous examination and would be required to meet the Policies of the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. It should be remembered that the site has been protected with the District Council and Burghley having made a significant investment. Otherwise, the location would have been purchased by another developer exclusively for housing. The proposal has a number of positives with a good mix of development, as well as providing employment. The site will give the opportunity to offer greater connectivity around the town.

Councillor A Croft appreciated that the Traffic Survey had been conducted during the Covid Lockdown, but he understood another survey had been conducted prior to this period which indicated that the traffic flow had reduced and there were much-reduced movements of HGVs.

**Proposal 2** – It was proposed by Councillor S Ford, seconded by Councillor Mrs E Hooper and **RESOLVED** by majority vote that application S20/2056 – Land North of Barnack Road is supported and the observations above are submitted. One vote Against, three Abstentions.

The Chairman drew the Council's attention to correspondence received from the District Council in respect of Sec. 106 funds from the Empingham Road development, which requires a response by the 22<sup>nd</sup> of January 2021. The Town Clerk is trying to negotiate an extension to the response date and the criteria for funding. All Councillors were asked to consider any appropriate proposals which may be able to be considered by the Town Council. It was the consensus that the funding should not be allocated to just one organisation. The Town Clerk highlighted that there is potential for the District Council to expect match funding by the Town Council. The Chairman confirmed that the Finance Committee needs initially to investigate this issue.

Chairman  
(The meeting closed at 5.40p.m.)