

Planning Committee



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL

Thursday, 9 July 2026 at 10.00 am
Council Chamber - Council Offices,
St. Peter's Hill, Grantham. NG31 6PZ

Committee Members: Councillor Helen Crawford (Chairman)
Councillor Penny Milnes (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor David Bellamy, Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing, Councillor Pam Byrd, Councillor Steven Cunnington, Councillor Patsy Ellis, Councillor Paul Fellows, Councillor Gloria Johnson, Councillor Max Sawyer, Councillor Peter Stephens, Councillor Sarah Trotter and Councillor Paul Wood

Agenda Supplement

4. **Application S26/0237** (Pages 3 - 4)

Proposal: Outline planning application for a residential development with all matters reserved except for access

Location: Land adjacent Heatherway House, Fenton Road, Stubton, NG23 5DB

Recommendation: To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning and Growth to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions

8. **Application S25/1526** (Pages 5 - 8)

Proposal: Outline application for a residential development (7 dwellings) with all matters reserved except for access

Location: Constables Field, Belton Lane, Manthorpe, Grantham

Recommendation: To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions

This page is intentionally left blank



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL



Additional Information Report

This report sets out additional information in relation to planning applications for consideration at the Planning Committee on 9 July 2026 that was received after the Agenda was published.

S26/0237

Proposal: Outline planning application for a residential development with all matters reserved except for access

Site Address: Land Adjacent Heatherway House, Fenton Road, Stubton, NG23 5DB

Additional information/points of clarification

Updated to wording of paragraph 7.35, for the revised wording:

7.35 The Conservation Officer further advised, the siting of the dwellings would be at odds with the general streetscape of the village as a backland development, which predominantly comprises set back detached or semi-detached dwellings, former farmsteads, and dispersed courtyard/cul-de-sac developments. This is, however, dependent on the final design, layout, material and scale of the development. No full assessment of the potential harm can be provided without these details. In principle, the access as proposed is not considered to cause harm to the heritage assets.

In respect of Anglian Waters response to the development, further clarification is provided below as to the evaluation of their response and resulting condition.

Anglian Water did raise an objection on the basis of the site connecting to the foul sewage network, based on cited capacity issues. Paragraph 7.67 states that Anglian Water requested a condition in respect of provision of details for foul sewage disposal, however this is not included within their comments and they requested monitoring be carried out for 12 months of flow monitoring to measure the total daily volume of treated effluent being discharged from the Stubton Water Recycling Centre (WRC) in respect of capacity. With the potential for the results of this monitoring to overcome the objection if the results showed that with the addition of the development, the level of flow would not exceed the limited of the WRC.

It is the Officers recommendation that this is not a reasonable requirement, given that Anglian Water have a statutory responsibility to allow developments to connect to their network. Furthermore, there are alternative drainage strategies that could be utilised that would not result in the requirement to connect to the network, such as indicated on this submission, with a package treatment plant. As such, the condition (Condition 6) within the suggested conditions, is the Officers recommendation, not Anglian Waters.

Further representation/statement

Since the publication of the planning agenda, a statement has been submitted by G Senior (Appendix 1), H Wilson (Appendix 2) and R Thornton (Appendix 3) all of which have appended in full to the end of this report.

The points within these statements can be summarised as follows:

- 5 new homes would represent 0.03% of SKDC's housing target, yet the harm to the small rural village would be irreversible
- Stubton is an unsustainable location with no facilities or scheduled public transport
- Damage to habitats of Great Crested Newts adjacent the site
- There is no significant housing demand in Stubton
- Drainage should not be conditioned with insufficient infrastructure
- Detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbours to the site
- Backland development would encroach into the open countryside and green space
- This and recent developments would be a 28% increase in the size of the village
- The weight given to the application of the tilted balance

It is the Officers assessment that the statement does not introduce any new planning considerations and each of these points as sufficiently addressed within the Committee Report and this subsequent additional item report.

In respect of the point raised about the drainage details and that they should not be conditioned, conditioning drainage details is a standard practice and there is no reason to delay the determination of the application to wait for further details which may not have yet been finalised.

Conditions

Finally, the wording to condition 13 within the conditions schedule has been updated as below, for the avoidance of doubt in restricting the number of dwellings on the site.

Amended Condition

13) No more than a maximum of 5 dwellings shall be permitted on this site.

Reason: To define the permission and for the avoidance of doubt

Agenda Item 8

S25/1526

Proposal: Outline application for a residential development (7 dwellings) with all matters reserved except for access

Site Address: Constables Field, Belton Lane, Manthorpe, Grantham

Conditions

The wording to condition 11 within the conditions schedule has been updated as below, for the avoidance of doubt in restricting the number of dwellings on the site.

Amended Condition

11) No more than a maximum of 7 dwellings shall be permitted on this site.

Reason: To define the permission and for the avoidance of doubt

Appendix 1 – G Senior

I live at Ellary House in Stubton and I object to this application.

The decision on this application is to be determined by the 'tilted balance' in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

NPPF clause 11(d)(ii) states that applications should be refused if the adverse impacts significantly outweigh the benefits. The tilted balance is exactly what it says - a balance with a preload applied to one side. The harm that this development would cause sits on the other side of the scale. There are numerous adverse impacts that clearly tip the balance the other way.

5 new homes would represent a tiny 0.03% of SKDC's housing target, yet the harm caused to our small rural village would be significant and irreversible. The following adverse impacts are all referred to in the policies in the NPPF and are relevant in considering the balance.

- 1) Stubton is a small rural village with no facilities and no scheduled public transport. It is not a sustainable location.
- 2) Great crested newts are present on site and in the adjacent pond, and their habitat would be damaged.
- 3) There is no significant demand for housing in Stubton.
- 4) Drainage infrastructure in the village is either at capacity or non-existent. Soakaways in the heavy clay are ineffective and could result in flooding on adjacent land. This should be addressed now rather than conditioned.
- 5) There would be a massive detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbours in terms of loss of privacy, overlooking and noise and light pollution.
- 6) The site has only ever been used as equestrian and for grazing horses and sheep. The proposal is backland development that would result in an unacceptable encroachment of buildings into the open countryside and green space. It would significantly damage the landscape character of the village's immediate environs.
- 7) This proposal, together with other recent approvals, would represent a 28% increase in the size of the village. This is disproportionately large and would destroy the nature and character of the village and its attractive rural setting.

The NPPF states that "planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment". This application is clearly at odds with that requirement.

The adverse impacts of approving this application significantly outweigh the benefit of the tiny contribution to SKDC's housing target. It would result in unacceptable and irreversible harm. I would ask the councillors to refuse the application.

Appendix 2 – H Wilson

Good morning

I am unfortunately unable to attend the meeting as I am on holiday in Cornwall and it is just too far to return.

I have made a formal objection to this planning application on the basis that it fails on numerous existing planning conditions.

We are continually being told that the tilted balance overrides normal planning restrictions and decision making. However, when does the tilted balance become the breakdown of all normal criteria and decision making for Committees like yourselves and for the Planning Officers who make recommendations to you. This is the third application within the last two years in Stubton the previous two having been granted, one after refusal by yourselves but the tilted balance came into play on Appeal.

This application for 5 further houses, which again fails on so many existing planning rules, would mean that in the last 3 or 4 years, 17 properties will have been built in Stubton which is a small rural village with no amenities other than a Church and Village Hall.

Have we reached the point where the Government of the day takes over the decision making from afar, bearing in mind that their local knowledge and appreciation of the rural villages being affected, is zero. The Planning Authorities like yourselves are the safeguards of democracy in this respect. You understand the area and have put together your Framework with your local knowledge. You are fighting for your own recognition and for democracy overall. rather than being told from afar by those who do not understand your area. You are also striving to uphold the rules and constraints you have introduced, in good faith, to best serve the community in which you live. Therefore, what is the point of these meetings if you allow yourselves to be so bound by constraints issued by others that you are unable to properly consider how the negative effects and harm of an application to the village in question, significantly outweigh the benefits as is the case with Stubton. I ask you to take the future of rural communities like Stubton into account when making your decision. Thank you.

Hugh Wilson

Home Farm

Stubton

Appendix 3 – R Thornton

Good morning

I understand all speaking slots have been allocated and that this can now only be added to the Planning Committee members information packs.

I would simply state that I do not habitually object to Planning Applications and indeed didn't for either of the recent ones approved in Stubton, despite the fact that I will now overlook an indicative nine new houses. My point is that this application will potentially add a further five houses to a tiny village (less than 80 houses). Given the application fails against so many criteria, surely the 'tilted balance' should be just that - a balance and not a policy of allowing any number of houses to be built in tiny communities that have already absorbed more than their fair share of the new housing burden.

Thank you for your time and attention regarding this.

Regards

Rob Thornton

Doddington Lane

Stubton