



# AGENDA

For a meeting of the  
**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

to be held on

**TUESDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2006**

at

**2.00 PM**

in the

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, ST PETERS HILL,  
GRANTHAM**

Duncan Kerr, Chief Executive

Committee Members:	Councillor George Chivers, Councillor Mike Exton, Councillor Brian Fines (Vice-Chairman), Councillor Bryan Helyar, Councillor Reginald Howard, Councillor Fereshteh Hurst, Councillor Mrs Maureen Jalili, Councillor Albert Victor Kerr, Councillor Alan Parkin (Chairman), Councillor Stanley Pease, Councillor Mrs Angeline Percival, Councillor Norman Radley, Councillor Bob Sandall, Councillor Ian Selby, Councillor Ian Stokes, Councillor Frank Turner and Councillor John Wilks
-----------------------	---

Committee Support Officer:	Malcolm Hall Tel: 01476 406118
-------------------------------	--------------------------------

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

1. **MEMBERSHIP THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE TO NOTIFY THE COMMITTEE OF ANY SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS.**
2. **APOLOGIES**
3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST: MEMBERS ARE ASKED TO DECLARE AN INTEREST IN MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE MEETING.**
4. **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 22ND AUGUST 2006**

**(Enclosure)**

**5. PLANNING MATTERS:**

To consider applications received for the grant of planning permission – reports prepared by the Area Planning Officers.

List for Debate

**(Enclosure)**

**6. INFORMATION RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND OTHER PLANNING ACTIVITIES.**

Report No. PLA613 by the Acting Development Control Services Manager.

**(Enclosure)**

**7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN, BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, DECIDES IS URGENT.**



# MINUTES

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

### TUESDAY, 22 AUGUST 2006

---

#### COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Exton  
Councillor Fines  
Councillor Howard  
Councillor Hurst  
Councillor Mrs Jalili  
Councillor Parkin (in the Chair)  
Councillor Mrs Percival

Councillor Mrs Radley  
Councillor Sandall  
Councillor Selby  
Councillor Stokes  
Councillor Turner  
Councillor Wilks

#### OFFICERS

Principal Planning Officer  
Senior Planning Officer  
Committee Support Officer

#### OTHER MEMBERS

Councillor Mrs. Woods

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 24.5, Councillor Mrs. Woods spoke in connection with application SU1.

---

#### 718. MEMBERSHIP

The Committee was notified by the Chief Executive that he had received a notice under regulation 13 of the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990 and had appointed Councillor Mrs. M. Radley in place of Councillor N. Radley for this meeting only.

#### 719. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chivers and Helyar.

#### 720. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none declared.

#### 721. MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 25TH JULY 2006

The minutes of the meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2006 were confirmed as a correct record of the decisions taken.

## 722. PLANNING MATTERS - LIST FOR DEBATE

### ***DECISION:-***

*To determine applications, or to make observations, as listed below:-*

#### **SU.1**

Application ref: S06/0593/69

Description: Erection of a single storey front extension and raising of roof

Location: 13, Fox Dale, Stamford

Decision: Deferred.

Noting comments made during the public speaking session from:-

Mr. D. Hollins – on behalf of the occupier of 15 Fox Dale, Stamford - objecting

together with report of site inspection, comments from Stamford Town Council, no objection from the Highway Authority, numerous representations from nearby residents, one representation in support and a further letter from a local resident, for discussions with the applicant with regard to an amended plan showing an extension to the rear of the property.

#### **SU.2**

Application ref: S06/0851/12

Description: Residential development (121 dwellings)

Location: Wherry Lane, Off South Road, Bourne

Decision: Deferred

To enable late comments received from the applicants, site owners and Highway Authority to be circulated with the agenda for the next meeting.

#### **SR.1**

Application ref: S06/0779/17

Description: Demolition of existing bridge and formation of new embankments and re-profiling of carriageway

Location: Redundant Railway Bridge (EBO/3), Carlby Road, Carlby

Decision: Deferred

Noting report of site inspection, comments from the Highway Authority, representations from nearby residents, Greatford Parish Council and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, submissions in support from the applicants and further representations from Braceborough and Wisthorpe Parish Council.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, the proposition was lost. It was then proposed and seconded that the application be deferred to enable information to be obtained following the monitoring of the cracks and settlement of the bridge and for an opinion on its likely useful life. On being put to the vote, the proposition was carried.

### **NR.1**

Application ref: S06/0909/21

Description: Demolition of existing dwelling & construction of 24 starter homes

Location: 24, Doddington Lane, Claypole

Decision: Deferred

Pending the receipt of further information on the drainage of the site, to be circulated with the agenda for the next meeting.

## **723. INFORMATION RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND OTHER PLANNING ACTIVITIES.**

The Acting Development Control Services Manager submitted his report PLA608, listing details of applications not determined within the eight week time period. Also submitted was a list of applications dealt with under delegated powers and a list of appeals and newly submitted appeals received during August 2006.

## **724. ATTENDANCE AT PLANNING INQUIRIES/HEARINGS AND HIRING OF PLANNING/LEGAL EXPERTISE**

The Chairman referred to his attendance, as a witness, at a recent planning inquiry. He said that as a result of this he was convinced that there was a need for training for Members as witnesses at inquiries/hearings and had accordingly given instructions to the Training Manager that an appropriate course be arranged. Members would be encouraged to attend in the event that they had voted for a refusal against officer advice and were required as a witness at a subsequent inquiry/hearing.

A Member referred to a letter sent by the Committee Support Officer in

relation to the hire of appropriate planning/legal expertise in the event that an application which was refused either with a recommendation to refuse or against officer recommendation to approve went to appeal. The Committee Support Officer clarified his letter and gave further information.

## **725. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 3:10pm.

# Agenda Item 5

## AGENDA ITEM 5

### Development Control Committee

**12 September 2006**

**NR.1 S06/0482/47**

Date Received: 31-Mar-2006

Applicant	<b>Mr &amp; Mrs M Jasinski</b> Little Scotland Farm, Scotland Lane, Ingoldsby, Grantham, NG334ES
Agent	Mr M O Powderly Bsc, MRTPI 26, Lincoln Drive, Melton Mowbray, Leics, LE13 0AH
Proposal	<b>Conversion of stables to two dwellings</b>
Location	<b>Little Scotland Farm, Scotland Lane, Ingoldsby</b>

<b>Site Details</b>	
<b>Parish(es)</b>	<b>Ingoldsby</b> Public footpath adjoins site Unclassified road Radon Area - Protection required Area of special control for adverts EN3 Area of great landscape value Airfield Zone - No consultation required Drainage - Welland and Nene

### **REPORT**

#### **The Site and its Surroundings**

The application site is on gently sloping land, situated on the south side and approximately 250 metres along Scotland Lane. The site is in the hamlet of Scotland, which extends westwards along Scotland Lane from its junction with the C418 Boothby Pagnell Road approximately 300 metres west of the village of Ingoldsby.

The hamlet is a mix of farmsteads and about eleven dwellings, varied in appearance and including dwellings of modern design as well as converted traditional farm buildings. The properties are irregularly spaced but predominantly in the form of frontage development either side of the lane. Scotland Lane is a no through road of approximately single carriageway width and with a number of passing places, mainly at the entrance to the properties.

At the roadside and adjacent to the farm entrance is a range of single storey, brick built, pantiled stables/barns arranged in a "U" shape configuration with the wings running away from road. Immediately to the rear of the barns is a modern portal-frame agricultural building with a lean-to structure.

To the south east of the farm yard is another portal frame building and the farmyard doubles as an operating centre for a haulage business run by the applicant.

## Site History

S03/021 Conversion of barns to 2 dwellings and erection of 5 new dwellings. Application called in and refused 24.10.04.

## The Proposal

This is an application for full planning permission to convert the stables into two dwellings and not for holiday lets. This proposal stands alone and is not linked to any other redevelopment of the farm.

The amended plans for the conversion will not enlarge the buildings and only one additional opening is to be created. Each conversion will have an independent access onto Scotland Lane.

The private amenity areas will be created within the courtyard and these will extend into the area of a building to be demolished. The gardens are not to abut the remaining barn because an access to the farmhouse is proposed.

Internal layouts of the barns mitigates overlooking and provides for a corridor between bedrooms and the existing farm access.

## Policy Considerations

### National Planning Policy

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development. PPS1 sets out the governments broad aims and objectives on planning policy. The key thread of this policy is the principle of sustainable development, the prudent use of natural resources and social cohesion and inclusion. There are numerous definitions of sustainable development but the basic principles involve the re-use of previously developed sites well related to the existing settlement and easily served by a range of transport choices for future occupants.

PPG3 – Housing. PPG3 specifically outlines the governments objectives in relation to the provision of housing. Whilst pre-dating PPS1, PPG3 also confirms the primacy of delivering sustainable developments. This guidance provides information that is of particular relevance to this proposal on the following matters (relevant paragraph numbers provided):

1. *Avoid housing development which makes inefficient use of land and provide for more intensive housing development in and around existing centres and close to public transport nodes (para 11).*
2. *The Governments commitment to maximising the re-use of previously-developed land to minimise the amount of greenfield land being taken for development. (para 22).*
3. *Undertaking of a sequential approach to site selection (para 30 and 31).*
4. *Making best use of land, i.e. avoiding developments below 30 to the hectare (para 57-58).*

5. *Defining previously developed land (annex c).*

PPS7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas. Paragraphs 17 and 18 refer to the re-use of agricultural buildings. This is a permissive policy which seeks to achieve commercial use of the buildings, where appropriate, before their use for residential purposes.

PPG24 – Planning and Noise. Sets out the criteria when considering noise issues.

### **Development Plan**

**Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands – RSS8.** The regional spatial strategy sets the overall housing requirement for the County. It also sets out policies for ensuring sustainable pattern of development, including a sequential approach to the location of development (Policy 2 & 3)

**Lincolnshire Structure Plan 2006.** This plan has now been adopted subject to legal challenge. As with all contemporary planning documents the promotion of sustainable development is the central plank of the revised Structure Plan. The Structure Plan translates the regional strategic housing requirement into district allocations. As Members will be aware South Kesteven's allocation has been cut to approximately 9,200, a figure which has largely been accommodated in commitments and urban capacity sites. The revised Structure Plan identifies the settlement hierarchy for the County.

Additionally the revised Structure Plan adopts a lower than national threshold for the delivery of previously developed sites at 40% of all new dwellings.

### **South Kesteven Local Plan 1995.**

Interim Housing Policy – Limits residential development in the “rural area”, i.e. all villages not defined as Local Service Centres and in the open countryside and only housing proposals that fall within one of three exceptions will be allowed. The third exception states:

Conversion of buildings provided that the following criteria are met:

- i) the building(s) contribute to the character and appearance of the local area by virtue of their historic, traditional or vernacular form;
- ii) the building(s) are in sound structural condition;
- iii) the building(s) are suitable for conversion without substantial alteration, extension or rebuilding;
- iv) the works to be undertaken do not detract from the character of the building(s) or their setting; and
- v) it can be demonstrated that all other alternative uses have been considered.

Policy EN1 – The Protection and Enhancement of the Environment. This is a general consideration policy that aims at ensuring that new developments do not have an adverse impact upon their environs.

Policy EN3 – Areas of great Landscape Value. This is a restrictive policy and development is measured against one of three criteria. The relevant criteria for this application is that it relates to the appropriate re-use or adaptation of existing agricultural and other rural

buildings provided that the proposed use, form, bulk, and general design of the converted buildings are in keeping with their surroundings.

### **Statutory Consultations**

Local Highway Authority: Advise that certain highway improvements are to be undertaken within the highway to widen the junction of Scotland Lane and the Boothby Pagnell Road; create a passing place approximately half way between the junction and the access to the site and improve the access and carriageway width opposite the site entrance.

Community Archaeologist: The proposed development does not affect any known archaeological sites.

Parish Council: Does not propose to enter any representations with regard to the application.

### **Representations as a result of publicity**

In respect of the original scheme five letters of objection were received and the following issues were raised:

- a) The Secretary of State decided that there should be no further development in the area of Scotland Lane.
- b) Where are the septic tanks to be located and what consideration is being given to their run off.
- c) The entrance to the haulage yard has been greatly reduced in width.
- d) Is this planning by stealth for future development.
- e) The call-in Inspector concluded:

“In my view there is no housing need justification for the residential development, including the barn conversions, at little Scotland Farm.”

“I conclude that the proposed housing would not have good accessibility to jobs, shops and services by modes of transport other than the car, with no significant potential for improving such accessibility”

“Overall I consider the residential development would not make a significant contribution to the development of a sustainable community”;

“I consider the mix of business and residential use in close proximity would not be compatible, especially in view of the position and building configuration of the barns”

- f) The current haulage business will continue in the farmyard adjacent to the proposed conversions and adjacent to the steel framed machine barn and store contrary to the conclusions presented at The Public Inquiry.
- g) The following questions on the application form are incorrect.
- h) Does the development involve anything other than houses or house extensions ?
- i) Does this application relate to any dwelling in connection with agriculture ?
- j) Does the applicant own or control any of the adjoining land ? There is a list of land holdings outside the blue line.
- k) New access onto Scotland are questioned as to their safety.

In respect of the amended scheme correspondence objecting to the development has been received from three individuals raising the following matters:

1. A letter with the amended plans mentions holiday homes has the application been changed ?
2. Previous comments still apply.
  3. The applicant's agent refers to a desire to relocate therefore the intention to develop holiday lets is not the real reason for the application and that this is an attempt to develop the site piecemeal.
4. A list of the applicant's land holdings is given in various parts of the district.
5. Adverse impact of noise on the future occupants of the conversions.

### **Planning Panel Comments**

25 July 2006– Defer the application to the Development Control Committee for full consideration.

### **Applicants Submissions**

The applicant's have submitted three letters in the course of this application, the first with the application, the second with the amended plans and a third in respect of noise amelioration.

These letters are also included in an appendix to this report

### **Planning Considerations**

The key issues of this application are precedent of previous decisions, policy, noise and the impact on the character of the area.

### **Precedent of Previous Decisions**

A previous decision is a material consideration and previous decisions by the Secretary of State must be given greater weight. The rationale for that is given by Mann LJ in North Wiltshire District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment [1992] 65 P&CR 137 at 145, in which he said:

“It was not disputed in argument that a previous appeal decision is capable of being a material consideration. The proposition is in my judgement indisputable. One important reason why previous decisions are capable of being material is that like cases should be decided in a like manner so that there is consistency in the appellate process. Consistency is self-evidently important to both developers and development control authorities. But it is also important for the purpose of securing public confidence in the operation of the development control system. I do not suggest and it would be wrong to do so, that like cases must be decided alike. An inspector must always exercise his own judgement. He is therefore free upon consideration to disagree with the judgement of another but before doing so he ought to have regard to the importance of consistency and to give his reasons for departure from the previous decision.

To state that like cases should be decided alike presupposes that the earlier case is alike and is not distinguishable in some relevant respect. If it is distinguishable then it usually will lack materiality by reference to consistency although it may be material in some other way. Where it is indistinguishable then ordinarily it must be a material consideration. A practical test for the inspector is to ask himself, whether, if I decide this case in a particular way am I

necessarily agreeing or disagreeing with some critical aspect of the decision in the previous case?"

In order for a previous decision properly to be taken into account it is necessary that not just the fact of the determination, grant or refusal of planning permission, should be known to the decision maker and taken into account, but regard should be had to the basis of the decision.

The applications determined by the Secretary of State related to the comprehensive redevelopment of the farmyard and the development of the farm at Bitchfield Road and the two were interlinked. The farmyard was to be developed by the conversion of the barns into two dwellings and the erection of 5 new dwellings.

Clearly this application is distinguishable from the previous application in that this is simply for the conversion of the barns/stables and deletes the new buildings for the other 5 dwellings. Further there is no proposal, linked or otherwise, for a farm at Bitchfield Road. It is then pertinent to consider whether it is material in some other way.

The objectors quote sections from the Inspectors Report and these have been set out above. Firstly attention is drawn to the Inspectors conclusion that there is no housing justification for residential development. This conclusion dealt with 1) new development of 5 houses and 2) change of use of existing buildings. The Inspector prefaced this conclusion by stating that there was a policy vacuum on the overall level of housing required in the district. This vacuum has been filled by the Interim Housing Policy that has identified locations for sustainable development..

The Interim Housing Policy restricts residential development in the hamlet of Scotland, and only development that accords with one of the three identified exceptions to development in non-sustainable locations can be recommended for approval. A common theme between this application and that at Scotland House is that officers consider that both the host buildings are buildings that contribute to the character and appearance of the local area by virtue of their historic, traditional or vernacular form; are in sound structural condition; are suitable for conversion without substantial alteration, extension or rebuilding; the works to be undertaken do not detract from the character of the building(s) or their setting; and it can be demonstrated that all other alternative uses have been considered.

The view that the barns at Little Scotland Farm contribute to the character of the area is re-inforced by the Inspector who states at paragraph 12.19 "The barn conversions and the use of the courtyard layout would be in keeping with the rural scene. The simple rectangular forms and the general massing would reflect the local character. The scale of the individual dwelling would respect the scale of neighbouring Development." She then went on to contrast this with the new buildings at the rear, and drawing on previous paragraphs in her report, would have an adverse impact on the character on the area that was mainly composed of frontage development. Your officers requested amended plans and there is only one new opening being created and would concur with both the Inspectors conclusions. It is considered that they are structurally sound, a structural engineers report has been submitted concluding their soundness, and that there are no substantial extensions.

Officers consider that the buildings, in both this application and at Scotland House, should not be used for other uses because this would introduce a business use at Scotland House and add further independent business uses at Little Scotland Farm. Officers consider that this would adversely affect both sites.

Your officers consider that the last quote from the Inspectors Report stated by the objectors is being taken out of context. Paragraph 12.65 quoted in full states "In relation to the proposed barn conversions, PPG7 encourages re-use for business rather than residential purposes. However, there was no information available on the availability of rural buildings for business re-use [7.10]. I consider a mix of business and residential use in close proximity would not be compatible, especially in view of the position and building configuration of the barns"

Your officers consider that the inspector was stating that the barns of this application were not suitable for business use because of their relationship to other dwellings. This conclusion, one with which your officers concur, is supported by the Inspector stating at paragraph 12.41 "...I consider the weight of the evidence is that the agricultural haulage business can operate satisfactorily from the existing site without causing significant harm to the living conditions of nearby occupiers through unreasonable disturbance."

To put the objector's construction on the mix of business and residential uses, that the barns are not suitable for residential development because of the haulage business, means that the two conclusions of the Inspector conflict. Your officer's construction is considered to be the logical meaning derived from the two conclusions.

Your officers conclude that application S03/0210 is a significant material consideration. However, the parts of the decision that are relevant to this proposal are only a part of the whole decision and are supportive in some respects as explained above. Taking the relevant elements of the previous decision, the Interim Housing Policy and the recent grant of permission for a similar change of use, also on Scotland Lane, there is sufficient reason to reach a conclusion on this proposal which differs from the Secretary of State's overall decision on the previous application.

This application has much in common with S06/0220 at Scotland House; one of the objectors has sought in correspondence to distinguish the application at Scotland House from this application by stating that "...it did not involve new residential building, as to my knowledge that barn conversion has been in lawful occupation since about 1999." Your officers disagree, firstly the building had been subject to a condition that it should be ancillary to the main dwelling house and because no certificate of lawfulness had been granted the occupation of the barn conversion was unlawful in 1999. In both cases there is no new building but the material change of use of buildings to independent dwellings.

## **Policy**

The key policy in this application is the Interim Housing Policy derived from RSS8, PPS7, PPG3, PPS1 and the Lincolnshire Structure Plan. Much of this policy has been rehearsed above and your officers conclude that this development accords with the criteria set out in exception 3 of the Interim Housing Policy and is therefore acceptable.

## **Noise**

Objectors have stated that noise from the haulage business will have an adverse impact. The applicant's have stated that the buyers will be aware of the situation when they purchase the properties. Whilst this may be true your officers consider that this impact should be addressed. PPG24 offers the following advice:

1. When assessing a proposal for residential development near a source of noise, local planning authorities should determine into which of the four noise exposure categories (NECs) the proposed site falls, taking account of both day and night-time noise levels.

Local planning authorities should then have regard to the advice in the appropriate NEC, as below:

NEC	
A	Noise need not be considered as a determining factor in granting planning permission, although the noise level at the high end of the category should not be regarded as a desirable level.
B	Noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications and, where appropriate, conditions imposed to ensure an adequate level of protection against noise.
C	Planning permission should not normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise.
D	Planning Permission should normally be refused.

3. The NEC noise levels should not be used for assessing the impact of industrial noise on proposed residential development because the nature of this type of noise, and local circumstances, may necessitate individual assessment and because there is insufficient information on people's response to industrial noise to allow detailed guidance to be given. However, at a mixed noise site where industrial noise is present but not dominant, its contribution should be included in the noise level used to establish the appropriate NEC.

Your officers have concluded that the site falls into Category B. Members attention is draw to the first page of the agent's letter received 14 August 2006 stating the measures to ameliorate noise and it is considered that a condition be attached to implement these measures. It is consider that the implementation of these measure will render the application acceptable with regard to noise.

### **Character of the Area**

The character of the area is composed of properties that are irregularly spaced but predominantly in the form of frontage development either side of the lane.

The Inspector concluded in paragraph 12.13 "... I found the farmyard and agricultural buildings to be in keeping with the rural landscape setting, because as explained in evidence by the Rule 6 third parties, the existing site is a typical working rural farmyard [8.20]. In contrast, the concentration of the new housing would introduce a development of atypical character." The Inspector further stated at paragraph 12.19 "... In assessing whether the scheme would reflect good design I have referred to the advice in the SPG [4.14]. The barn conversions and the use of a courtyard layout would be in keeping with the rural scene. The simple rectangular forms and the general massing would reflect local

character. The scale of the individual dwelling would respect the scale of neighbouring development ...”

This development will continue that form of development and in this respect conforms to the criteria of Policy EN3 and is not disputed by the Inspector and therefore considered acceptable.

### **Other matters raised by Objectors**

The objectors have raised other matters relating to land holdings outside the red and blue lines of the applicant and whether these can be developed. These comments are made in conjunction with speculation that the refused application is to be made piecemeal and that an application to relocate the farm to Bitchfield Road will be made. The applicant has stated openly that he still desires to relocate at some time and that he will consult Planning Officers prior to making any application. Any such proposal would have to be considered on its own merits, and current policy, and against the conclusions of the Secretary of State, for example, agricultural justification and landscape impact.

Other matters have been raised in correspondence by both objectors and applicant and are considered to be not material to the determination of this application.

### **Conclusion**

It is concluded that this application is distinguished from the previous refusal because of the nature of the development and that any material issues have been addressed through the Interim Housing Policy. It is concluded that the development accords with the criteria of the Interim Housing Policy and Policy EN3. The development is considered acceptable.

### **RECOMMENDATION:** That the development be Approved subject to condition(s)

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development shall not be commenced until the works required by Lincolnshire County Council Highways within the highway have been completed.
3. The development shall accord with details stated in a letter from Mr M Powderly dated 14 August 2006 in respect of noise mitigation measures.
4. Notwithstanding submitted details, no development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the building(s) are occupied, or in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with approved details.
5. Before the dwelling(s) is/are occupied, the access and turning space shall be completed in accordance with the approved plan, The Proposed Layout received 12 June 2006, and retained for that use thereafter.

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modification), no development relating to Class A of Part 1 of Schedule 2 (erection of extensions) shall be undertaken without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.
7. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) shall be constructed.
8. This consent relates to the application as amended by amended plans received on 12 June 2006.
9. Before any of the works hereby approved are commenced, the applicant shall arrange for access into the site by a recognised expert in order to undertake a survey to establish whether the site is occupied by bats or barn owls, protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. The results of such a survey shall be submitted to the District Planning Authority and, if it confirms the presence of bats or owls, shall be accompanied by a scheme of mitigation detailing the periods within which the development will be undertaken. Such a scheme as may be approved in writing shall be strictly adhered to during the period in which the development is undertaken.
10. All materials to external elevations shall be made good using matching and where available original materials.
11. Before any development is commenced, details including location and means of disposal of surface water and foul drainage shall be submitted to and approved by the District Planning Authority, and no building shall be occupied until the drainage works have been provided.
12. Large scale details of all external joinery, to a scale of not less than 1:20, to include cross sections to show cills, lintols, etc., shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development.

The reason(s) for the condition(s) is/are:

1. Required to be imposed pursuant to section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. To improve highway safety to accord with PPG25.
3. To mitigate the impact of possible noise to accord with Policy EN1 and PPG24.
4. To prevent overlooking to and from the development and to reduce the impact of the development on the appearance of the area and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.
5. In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway and the safety of the users of the site, and in accordance with Policy T3 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.
6. To protect the character and visual amenities of the area and the amenity of adjacent residential properties, and in accordance with the Interim Housing Policy and Policy EN3 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.
7. The planning authority wish to be in a position to determine the effects that such development would have on the surrounding area and in accordance with the Interim Housing Policy and Policy EN3 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.
8. For the avoidance of doubt.

9. To ensure that satisfactory provision is made to safeguard the habitat of protected species that may be present on the site and in accordance with Policies EN1 and EN3 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.
10. To maintain the appearance of the building and in accordance with Policy EN3 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.
11. To ensure satisfactory provision is made for the disposal of foul and surface water drainage from the site and in accordance with PPG25 and Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.
12. No such details have been submitted and the district planning authority wish to be in a position to ensure that the proposed details are sympathetic to the property and in accordance with Policy EN3 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.

Note(s) to Applicant

1. You are advised that the application site falls within an area which requires protection from Radon. You are advised to contact the District Council's Building Control Services to ascertain the level of protection required, and whether geological assessment is necessary.

\* \* \* \* \*



Applicant	<b>BRB (Residuary) Limited</b> 5th Floor, Hudson House, York, YO1 6HP
Agent	Jacobs Babtie West Offices, City Business Centre, Station Rise, York, YO1 6HT
Proposal	<b>Demolition of existing bridge and formation of new embankments and re-profiling of carriageway</b>
Location	<b>Redundant Railway Bridge (EBO/3), Carlby Road, Carlby</b>

<b>Site Details</b>	
<b>Parish(es)</b>	Carlby C Class Road Demolition of any building - BR1 Radon Area - Protection required Area of special control for adverts EN3 Area of great landscape value Airfield Zone - No consultation required Drainage - Welland and Nene

## REPORT

### The Site and its Surroundings

The application site is a redundant, three-span, railway bridge of brick construction, on the C class road from Carlby to Greatford. It carries the road over the former Stamford to Bourne line and is only 120m to the east of the junction with the A6121.

The cutting beneath the bridge is overgrown and subject to fly-tipping.

### Site History

There is no planning history relating to the bridge subject of this application.

### The Proposal

The proposal is to demolish the bridge, form new embankments and re-profile the carriageway so that it is the same level as the road on either side.

The bridge has structural problems, as evidenced by the cracks in the brickwork above the arches and has been subject to monitoring for some time.

### Policy Considerations

PPG13 – Transport.

### South Kesteven Local Plan

Policy EN1 – Protection and Enhancement of the Environment.

Policy EN3 – Areas of Great Landscape Value.

## **Statutory Consultations**

Local Highway Authority: Requests one condition and Note to Applicant – see below.

Community Archaeologist: Comments awaited.

Parish Council: Comments awaited – notified 7 June 2006.

## **Representations as a result of Publicity**

The application has been advertised in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement. Letters have been received from the following:

1. P Launders, Spa Halt, Spa Road, Braceborough.
2. Rachael & Richard Barron-Clark, Church View House, Greatford.
3. Greatford Parish Council.
4. Alan & Betty Rose, Ash Lodge, Carlby Road, Greatford.
5. Mike & Pat Smith, 14 Greatford Gardens, Greatford.
6. Dr Ann Henley, 4 Greatford Gardens, Greatford.
7. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.

Planning issues raised:

- a) Ownership of land to either side of bridge (P Launders), therefore need to know extent of works on either side. (1)
- b) If bridge unsafe for heavy traffic put weight limit on to prevent use by HGV's. (3)
- c) Attractive addition to the countryside. (2)
- d) Demolition would remove hump in road to detriment of road safety. (3)
- e) Adverse impact on Greatford parish resulting from removal of bridge. Carlby Road is one of principal approach roads to Greatford and already carries considerable volume of HGV traffic using it as a shortcut. Removal would lead to increase in traffic on road already unsuitable. Junction with Stamford Road inadequate for current traffic. Road surface in Greatford not good enough for existing problem, infill arches to retain humped profile. Question findings of Ecological Survey that no protected species present. (1)
- f) Area beneath bridge provides habitat for wildlife. (1)
- g) Proposal will increase traffic and damage to environment of Greatford Conservation Area. (2)
- h) Removal would enable fast moving traffic to approach busy Essendine/Bourne Road even faster with increased risk of collision. (1)
- i) Ecological survey required. (1)

## **Applicants Submissions**

“Jacobs act as Consulting Engineers/Agents for the British Railway Board (Residuary) Ltd, who own a large proportion of the railway structures throughout the country that are associated with redundant railway lines.

EBO/3 is a 3 span brick arch bridge. The abutments, piers, spandrels and parapets are of brick construction.

The side arches show vertical fractures from the quarter points of the arches. This is consistent with the development of hinges within the arch. In addition there are cracks stretching from the middle of each barrel at the springing line from the abutments running longitudinally for approximately 1 metre.

Only a small area of the abutments are visible but it would appear that there has been some degree of settlement indicated by the position of cracking in the arch barrels. The parapets have significant cracking. These cracks are being monitored but there are significant signs of rotation of the parapets with crack widths up to 40mm at coping level.

The structure is in poor condition and has been subject to a 3 monthly monitoring scheme for some time. A feasibility study was undertaken by Jacobs in 2004/5 to consider possible remedial action. The resulting recommended scheme includes the demolition of the bridge superstructure and re-profiling of the existing carriageway to remove the “hump” in the road, forming of new embankments (in the redundant cutting) and erection of timber post and rail fencing (adjacent to the re-profiled section of carriageway) and quick growing Hawthorne hedging.

An Ecological survey was undertaken by the Robert Stebbings Consultancy Ltd to ascertain whether any protected species are present in the vicinity of the structure. The report concludes that there are no specially designated wildlife areas around the structure and no known protected species were present.

A safety audit of the scheme is currently being undertaken by Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership. A stage 1 (outline) audit has already been completed and there were no comments regarding the scheme in principle.”

## **Conclusions**

The bridge subject of this application displays clear signs of structural defect. It does not benefit from any statutory protection. The former railway line is not covered by any wildlife or nature conservation designation.

A copy of the Ecological Survey referred to in the applicants supporting statement has been submitted and copy forwarded to the parish council.

Copies of the representations referred to highway safety issues have been taken by the representative of the Local Highway Authority.

### **Summary of Reason(s) for Approval**

The proposal is in accordance with national and local policies as set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note PPG13 (Transport) and policies EN1 and EN3 of the South Kesteven Local Plan. There are no material considerations that indicate against the proposal though conditions have been attached.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the development be Approved subject to condition(s)

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. Prior to the commencement of the approved development the works to the public highway in conjunction with the re-profiling of the carriageway shall be agreed and certified by the local planning authority.

The reason(s) for the condition(s) is/are:

1. Required to be imposed pursuant to section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. In the interests of the safety of users of the public highway, in accordance with PPG13 - Transport.

### **Note(s) to Applicant**

1. No works shall commence on site until a Section 278 Agreement under the Highways Act 1980, has been entered into with the local highway authority (Lincolnshire County Council) for the highway improvement works in conjunction with the road re-profiling.

This application was deferred from the last meeting for Members to undertake a site inspection.

The Highway Authority have made the following additional comments in response to representations on this application:

***"In respect of the removal of this bridge and the 'levelling' of carriageway alignment would be constructed/designed and approved to the requirements of this (highway) authority and current regulations.***

As part of the scheme the authority will look at enhancing the signing and junction arrangements from Carlby Road onto the A6121, Stamford Road. The authority is aware of HGV issues in this area, but it would be unreasonable to request refusal of this application".

The following representations were not included on the agenda for the last meeting:

From Carlby Parish Council:

1. The bridge is of historic interest.
2. Existing hedgerow on either side of bridge is mixed mature native trees and shrubs, which is better for wildlife than just hawthorn, as proposed.
3. Bridge acts as a speed hump for traffic approaching A6121 junction from Greatford.
4. Proposal would have a detrimental effect on the environment of this rural area.
5. Why has speed restriction not been imposed if bridge is structurally unsound?

From members of the public:

1. Clive Osborne, 7 Main Street, Greatford
2. Dr K M Langley, The Grange, Bourne Road, Carlby
3. Mrs L M Webb, 1 Old Bridge Cottage, Greatford
4. Mr G M and Mrs H J Campbell, The Brimbles, Rectory Drive, off Carlby Road, Greatford

Issues raised:

- a) Proposal will add to the problem of HGV's using this route to avoid the HGV ban in Stamford and as a shortcut, rather than following the recommended lorry routes. (4)
- b) HGV traffic is destroying the road surface and edges of the carriageway, despite frequent costly repairs. (2)
- c) Removal and re-profiling will increase speeds on approach to junction with A6121. (3)
- d) This type of bridge is part of character of English roads and Countryside. Should be protected. (2)
- e) Proposal will mitigate against the possibility of old railway being used as a linear park. (1)
- f) Weight limit should be imposed and bridge retained. (2)

**This application was deferred from the last meeting for the submission of further information on the structural condition of the bridge and its life expectancy.**

The following additional information has been submitted by the Agents:

Thank you for your letter regarding the further deferment of a decision regarding planning permission.

With regard to more detailed information on the structural condition of the bridge, it should be noted that the critical defects were detailed in the "Additional Information" submitted with the planning application.

I have included an extract from the Condition Report issued to our client which basically gives the same details as those given in the "Additional Information".

### **Construction Type**

EBO 3 is a 3 span brick arch bridge with span to rise ratio of approximately 4:1. Little is known about the construction form of the abutment construction; other than that they are constructed from brick. The piers are approximately 2.6m high (above ground level) but nothing is known about the foundations at present. The parapets are of brick construction with a ridged coping-stone and are approximately 1.2m high. All the brickwork appears to be English bond, with the arch barrels being 4 no. rings thick (475mm approx).

### **Structural Capacity**

The actual capacity of the EBO 3 is not known but the bridge is being monitored quarterly for continuing movement.

### **Summary of Condition**

- Arch barrel**

The centre arch barrel is in fair condition, however the side arches exhibit some vertical cracking from the quarter points of the arches. This is consistent with the development of hinges within the arch. In addition there are cracks stretching from the middle of each barrel at the springing line from the abutments running longitudinally for approximately 1 metre.

- Abutments**

Little of the abutments are visible but it would appear that there has been a certain degree of settlement indicated by the position of cracking in the arch barrels.

- Piers**

The piers are not showing any sign of rotation or settlement and as such are in reasonable condition. There does not appear to be any water staining on them or significant open joints.

- Parapets**

The parapets have significant cracking particularly 7m in from the west pilasters. These cracks are being monitored but there are significant signs of rotation of the parapets with crack widths up to 40mm at coping level.

- Wingwalls**

There are no wingwalls on the structure, instead the ground ramps at a gradient of approximately 1:1.5 down to the former track bed.

- Cause of Defects**

The cracking to the side arches, spandrels and parapets above is consistent with the abutments having rotated away from the former railway and suffered settlement relative to the piers.

The defects described in the "Additional Information" and above extract are symptoms of the rotation of the abutments.

The fractures in the parapets and spandrels as well as the deviation in the line of the string course are all due to this movement.

To estimate the expected future life of the bridge is very difficult as it is dependent on the degree of movement of the aforementioned abutments and associated fractures and hinges. The structure has been subject to a 3 monthly monitoring scheme where movement has been recorded at various monitoring points throughout the structure. The results have shown that the movement is continuous but also shows seasonal variation. Due to the

varying results and the complexity of arch structures, the expected future life of the bridge cannot be easily determined and it would not be appropriate for Jacobs or BRB (Residuary) Ltd to quote a figure.

BRB (Residuary) Ltd's first priority is to ensure the safety of members of the public using their infrastructure. The design submitted will remove any future risk to the public that this structure poses.

At the last meeting several Members suggested the bridge should be retained for its historic interest. With this in mind, it has been inspected by the Conservation Officer and his conclusions are as follows:

It is basically a 3 arch brick structure, with a tarmac deck and guard walls on either side of the road.

The walls include a smith plinth and flush gabled brick coping, and coped blue brick pillars at either end. The coursing is alternate headers and stretchers in red brick with occasional blue brick infill. On the outside, there is evidence of more substantial areas of blue brickwork in the arches themselves and on the infill between, but this appears to be very random in nature, with no particular decorative pattern being followed. The only decorative feature appears to be a semi-circular brick string course above the arches, which this may simply serve to define the deck level on the other side.

There is evidence of ongoing spalling in the arches and elsewhere, and potentially serious failure in parts of the walling adjacent to the road. Some repair work has been carried out here, but with no regard to the appearance of the structure. "Tell tales" are presently in place to measure any current movement, and it is likely to deteriorate further.

This bridge is in my view a simple functional structure of basic design for its purpose. Of its type I would consider it to be of little architectural or historic merit, and it appears to have outlived its purpose.

I do not therefore consider that on conservation grounds, a case can be made for its retention.

\* \* \* \* \*

**SR.2    S06/1010/78**

Date Received: 13-Jul-2006

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Stamford Developers Limited</b> C/o Agent
<b>Agent</b>	Jonathon Hartley The Old Curiosity Shop, 28, St. Peters Street, Stamford, PE9 2PF
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Conversion of garage to playroom and orangery extension</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>Plot A Adj, Barclay House, Bertie Lane, Uffington</b>

<b>Site Details</b>	
<b>Parish(es)</b>	<b>Uffington</b> Conservation Area Public footpath abuts site Unclassified road Radon Area - Protection required Area of special control for adverts

	C9 Area Conservation Policy EN3 Area of great landscape value Airfield Zone - No consultation required Drainage - Welland and Nene
--	---

## **REPORT**

### **Representations Received**

Parish Council:

At our recent meeting the above application was discussed and comments made:

- All the Parish Council's comments still stood, as in letters dated 1 February 2006 and 11 July 2006. This development was out of keeping for the area around the Listed Bertie Arms was too large for the plot and any further extensions would just exacerbate the problem.
- This dwelling had previously been moved to the south away from Bertie Lane, and therefore made it less overpowering to the adjacent Bertie Barn property. These proposed extensions will bring it back nearer to the house and lane once more.
- A site visit should be considered.

Local Highway Authority: No observations.

Community Archaeologist: Does not affect any known archaeological site.

Neighbours and other representations: Two representations have been received raising, in summary, the following issues:

- Third time garage has been re-sited.
- Will result in lengthy blank wall outlook to The Old Smithy.
- Alternative garage tacked onto end wall of the house will be most pervasive. Without garage where will owners vehicles be parked?

### **Officer Report**

#### **Reason for referral to Committee**

This application has been referred to Committee at the request of the local member, Cllr Moore.

#### **The Site and its Surroundings**

The application property is one of two detached dwellings currently under construction on the south side of Bertie lane, between the existing residential properties of The Old Smithy and Barclay House. The plot formerly formed part of the garden to Barclay House and part of a paddock to the south.

Both houses were the subject of a permission in April 2005 (S04/1447/78) but that on Plot A was the subject of a more recent approval for a revised scheme (S06/0022/78) which incorporated a single storey element projecting forward to within 10.5m of Bertie Lane.

The neighbouring plot has approval for a detached double garage positioned within 2m of Bertie Lane.

### **The Proposal**

Permission is now sought to add a double garage to the front of the house to replace that in the approved scheme, which is to be converted to a 'playroom'. This would bring the single storey forward projection a further 5m towards Bertie lane an result in a continuous wall along the western boundary with The Old Smithy of 4.4m for the single storey element and a further 4.1m for the two storey part of the house. The former would, at its closest, be 1m from the boundary with The Old Smithy and the latter would be set back 4m from it.

It is also proposed under this application to add an 6m x 3.8m Orangery onto the south eastern part of the rear of the house.

The materials and details for both would match those of the house as previously approved.

### **The Main Issues**

**The main issues associated with this proposal involve the impact of the proposed forward extension on the neighbouring property to the east and on the street scene of this part of the Uffington Conservation Area.**

### **Planning Policy**

PPG15 – Planning and the Historic Environment.

#### Lincolnshire Structure Plan

Policy BE3 – Conservation of the Historic Building Environment.

Conservation Areas and their setting will be protected from development damaging to their setting.

#### South Kesteven Local Plan

Policy H6 – Development in Towns and Villages

Extensions to existing dwellings will be assessed on their impact on the form and character of the settlement and on the community and its local environment.

Policy EN1 – Protection and Enhancement of the Environment

In respect of buildings, reflect the general character of the area through layout, siting, design and materials.

Policy C9 – Development in Conservation Areas to be considered having regard to:

- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
- The appropriateness of the proposal in terms of design, scale and materials; and
- The impact of any new use on the area.

## **Site History**

Previous applications on this site are as follows:

S06/0022/78	Erection of dwelling and garage and change of use of paddock to domestic garden. Approved – August 2006.
S04/1447/78	Erection of two detached dwellings. Approved – April 2005.
S04/0484/78	Erection of dwelling. Withdrawn – August 2004.
S03/0180/78	Residential Development (Outline) Renewal. Approved – May 2003.
S99/1208/78	Residential Development (Outline). Approved – March 2000.

## **Considerations**

### **Impact on Conservation Area**

It is considered that the proposed development would have no adverse impact on the street scene of this part of the Conservation Area. The details and materials are to be the same as the house already approved and the forward extension would not be as close to Bertie Lane as the plans approved in 2004 or the garage on the adjoining plot to the east. The house originally approved for this plot had a garage positioned within 2m of the Bertie Lane.

### **Impact on neighbours amenities**

Whilst the forward extension would impact on the neighbouring property to the west (The Old Smithy), which has a window facing onto the site, but not to a degree that warrants refusal or necessitates redesign. Trees and shrubbery, now removed, formerly ran along this boundary curtailing light and outlook in a similar to the proposed extension. The Orangery extension to the rear would have no impact on the surroundings.

The existing garage to this house could be converted to habitable accommodation without the need for planning permission, once the dwelling is built and occupied.

## **Summary of Reason(s) for Approval**

The proposal is in accordance with national and local policies as set out in Planning Guidance Note PPG15, Policy BE3 of the Lincolnshire Structure Plan and Policies H6, C9 and EN1 of the South Kesteven Local Plan. There are no material considerations that indicate against the proposal though conditions have been attached.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the development be Approved subject to condition(s)

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

The reason(s) for the condition(s) is/are:

1. Required to be imposed pursuant to section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. To maintain the appearance of the building and in accordance with Policies EN1, C9 and H6 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.

Note(s) to Applicant

1. Your attention is drawn to the enclosed Planning Guidance Note No 1 entitled 'Archaeology and Your Development'.
2. You are advised that the application site falls within an area which requires protection from Radon. You are advised to contact the District Council's Building Control Services to ascertain the level of protection required, and whether geological assessment is necessary.

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicant	<b>Mr P Doyle, Bloor Homes</b> Stirling House, The Avenue, Cliftonville, Northampton, NN1 5BT
Agent	Mr R A Woolston, rg & p The Old School, 346, Loughborough Road, Leicester, LE4 5PJ
Proposal	<b>Residential development</b>
Location	<b>Former Quarry Farm Brickworks, Little Casterton Road, Stamford</b>

<b>Site Details</b>	
<b>Parish(es)</b>	<p><b>Stamford</b></p> <p>Adj authority - Rutland CC - AA6</p> <p>C Class Road</p> <p>Radon Area - Protection required</p> <p>Section 106/52 applies on site</p> <p>H2 Housing - Stamford</p> <p>Airfield Zone - No consultation required</p> <p>EA: Adj not waste disposal site - TIP2</p> <p>Drainage - Welland and Nene</p> <p>Wildlife - g/c newts etc - WL3</p>

## REPORT

### The Site and its Surroundings

The 4.92ha application site is the former Williamson Cliff brickworks on Little Casterton Road.

The site has been cleared of buildings.

There are existing residential properties to the south, south-east, south-west and east. To the west are the former brick clay pits with full planning permission for residential development and the north agricultural land in Rutland.

There is a steady fall across the site from north to south.

### Site History

The site has outline planning permission for residential development granted on 27 July 2005 (S02/1670/69). The permission was subject to a Section 106 Agreement covering the following:

- i) Affordable Housing – 15% of total numbering the ratio of 60% for rent and 40% shared equity.
- ii) Green Areas – 40 sq.m. per unit POS and 20 sq.m. per unit as play areas. A LEAP within POS £12,000 commuted sum towards future maintenance.
- iii) Highway Contributions. £25,000 towards off-site improvements. £65,000 towards Community Travel Zone.

The Outline approval did not specify a housing density or a maximum number of units.

### **The Proposal**

Reserved Matters approval is sought for a layout comprising 183 dwellings, a mixture of 3, 2 and 1½ storey dwellings. 27 of the units would be Social Housing.

The main point of access to the site would be off Little Casterton Road. The site will connect with the development already approved to the west and ultimately, via a tortuous route to discourage 'rat-running' with Belvoir Close.

The density of development would be 43.3 units per hectare.

The Public Open Space provision would be 0.73 ha.

### **Policy Considerations**

#### Central Government Policy Statements

PPG3 – Housing 2000

PPG25 – Development and Flood Risk

PPS23 – Planning and Pollution Control

#### Lincolnshire Structure Plan – Deposit Draft

Policy H2 – Housing on Previously Developed Land

#### South Kesteven Local Plan

Policy H6 – Residential Development on Unallocated Sites

Policy EN1 – Protection and Enhancement of the Environment

### **Statutory Consultations**

Local Highway Authority: Minor amendments to visibility splays and road surfaces required. Final comments awaited.

Environment Agency:

No objection on Flood Risk.

Objection on contamination grounds pending submission of further information.

## Housing Solutions:

Plans indicate that, in-line with the Section 106 Agreement 15% affordable housing will be provided on site. The plans indicate 27 affordable units 'pepper-potted' on site.

## Leisure and Cultural Services:

No objection. Play equipment should comply with NPFA recommendations and to BS EN1176/BS. All proposals should have local planning authority's approval prior to provision.

## East Midlands Regional Assembly:

Thank you for your consultation dated 13 April 2006. My understanding is that this application is for approval of details following grant of outline consent in July 2005 (ref. S02/1670/69). Therefore, there are no conformity issues of principle arising.

RSS8 Policy 31 promotes conservation of the historic environment and is particularly applicable to historic towns such as Stamford. The efforts the local authority has made in the selection of building materials that are sympathetic to the town's character have achieved significant benefits both on new buildings within the built up framework and on edge of town developments that can be seen from some miles away across the surrounding countryside. This work has strong accordance with the above policy. In this context, it may be appropriate to select bricks that are similar to those formerly produced on the site, limestone type dressings and roof tiles that are sympathetic to the Collyweston slates historically used throughout the town and surrounding locality.

## East Midlands Development Agency:

Thank you for your letter dated 13 April 2006 requesting the comments of emda on the above planning application. You will have received a copy of the Notification Criteria which emda sent to all local authorities in June 2004. The above application falls under Criterion 1(b):

*Residential development comprising of more than 100 dwellings in the Eastern Sub-area.*

Significant development of the type proposed is considered to be within the provisions of Article 10(1)(zc)(ii) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2003.

This reserved matters application for residential development comprises a total number of 183 units (140 houses/bungalows and 43 flats/apartments) with associated car parking and landscaping. Outline planning permission for residential development has been granted in July 2005.

The above application is for a part of a brownfield site previously used as a brick manufacturing works. The reclamation and reuse of this site is welcomed as it is in line with targets for re-using previously developed land for housing as set out in the Site Provision and Development Strand of the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) 'Destination 2010'.

We welcome the fact that the Design Statement includes sustainable transport proposals such as a connecting bus route through the site, cycle routes and public footpaths. The location of the site approximately one mile from the town centre of Stamford supports sustainable forms of transport.

Therefore, emda supports this application and recommends approval.

Community Archaeologist: Proposed development does not affect any known archaeological sites.

Lincs Police Architectural Liaison Officer:

1. Lighting to parking areas.
2. Minimum of 1800mm high perimeter fencing.
3. Landscaping to maximum growth height of 1m.
4. 900mm rolled top fence to be erected around the perimeter of each public open space with self-closing gated access.

Stamford Town Council:

- The Planning committee is alarmed at this proposal.
- Although the Committee has been informed that they cannot consider the 'big picture' of the impact of a further development of this size on the town, it is noted that this proposal is contrary to Policy H2 of the existing Local Plan in that it is a major development sited at the urban edge of the town.
- Moreover, it takes the overall numbers of new houses to close to even above the required numbers in Stamford up to 2021.
- In addition, the Committee believes that the impact of the increased traffic generated, will be detrimental both in the immediate vicinity onto the adjacent already inadequate feeder roads and on the town as a whole.
- The Committee would prefer this development not to occur, but if it does, they would wish to see the road through the site re-configured to make it less usable as a 'rat-run' for those wishing to travel from one part of the town to another, or as an alternative road from west to east or vice-versa.
- The Committee also see a need for community facilities, a hall or centre and play areas to be included.
- The Committee is also not convinced that the drainage survey adequately reflects the actual situation as it is known that areas close and below this site already suffer from flooding in heavy rain.
- Recommend refusal.

English Nature: No objection.

Rutland County Council: Concerns about traffic generation onto Little Casterton Road and through the village of Little Casterton.

### **Representations as a result of publicity**

The application has been advertised in accordance with statutory requirements and the Statement of Community Involvement the closing date for representations being 19 May 2006.

Representations have been received from the following:

1. M Challis, 1 Elton Close, Stamford.
2. Mr M N Christie, 1 Eshton, Wynyard Woods, Wynyard Estate, Teesside.
3. E Taylor, 1 Gainsborough Road, Stamford.
4. Garry Smith, 1 Haddon Road, Stamford.
5. R & V Crossley, 12 Haddon Road, Stamford.
6. S Rawnsley, 13 Elton Close, Stamford.
7. A Denness, 14 Haddon Road, Stamford.
8. C D & B M Potter, 15 Chatsworth Road, Stamford.
9. Gail Burnham, 16 Elton Close, Stamford.
10. Stamford Civic Society, 17 Ermine Rise, Great Casterton.
11. Mr K A Edwards, 18 Haddon Road, Stamford.
12. Mr & Mrs A S Leonard, 2 Haddon Road.
13. Jane Bateman, 20 Ancaster Road.
14. Mrs I Haynes, 20 Haddon Road.
15. S & J Puttrich, 24 Elgar Way.
16. Rev Mrs M E Lloyd, 29 Elgar Way.
17. Mrs A M Gibbs, 3 Elton Close.
18. T M Johnson, 33 Elgar Way.
19. Keith Hansell, 40 Waverley Gardens.
20. Mr & Mrs J Goff, 43 Waverley Gardens.
21. Mr M E Allman, 45 Little Casterton Road.
22. Mr E Wright, 47 Little Casterton Road.
23. Mr P K Jarvis, 49 Little Casterton Road.
24. Mr & Mrs M Griggs, 5 Elton Close.
25. M & P Callow, 5 Gainsborough Road.
26. Mr N Liu, 5 Haddon Road.
27. Miss A Holwell, 55 Little Casterton Road.
28. Mrs E Broom, 6 Haddon Road.
29. Mr A M Christie, 6 Ravel Close.
30. John Milliard, 6 Waverley Gardens.
31. K Wallace, 7 Elton Close.
32. Mr & Mrs J Owen, 8 Elton Close.
33. L & P Brown, 8 Haddon Road.
34. B & D Carter, 9 Elton Close.

The issues raised are:

- a) Surrounding road network cannot cope with existing levels of traffic. (20)
- b) Increased flooding at junction of Waverley Gardens and Little Casterton Road. (1)
- c) Shops should be provided in development site. (3)
- d) Design out of character with existing properties. (4)
- e) Visually intrusive development. (1)
- f) Overlooking and loss of privacy. (13)
- g) Inadequate infrastructure for scale of development proposed. (5)
- h) Social considerations, police, medical, education. (1)
- i) Density too high. (9)
- j) Loss of privacy and sunlight from three storey units close to boundaries with existing properties. (12)
- k) Inadequate parking for three storey units. (4)
- l) Environmental hazard due to 'hotspots' needing special treatment and producing toxic dust. (2)
- m) Established trees on the boundary may be uprooted to accommodate new buildings. (1)
- n) Location of affordable housing contrary to government policy on social inclusion. (1)
- o) Three storey units out of context with other buildings in the area. (3)
- p) Unreasonable area of public open space. (1)
- q) Multiple-occupancy dwellings should not be allowed. (1)
- r) Nursery/primary school facilities should be provided within site. (1)
- s) Will create a dominant and oppressive environment. (6)
- t) Increase noise and disturbance. (6)
- u) Inadequate off-street parking provision. (6)
- v) Layout plan omits mature trees to rear of 18 Haddon Road. (1)
- w) Design of three storey units not in-keeping with remainder of proposals. (3)

- x) Insufficient medical and educational facilities in town to cater for proposed development. (6)
- y) concern at noise and disturbance during development period. (1)
- z) Development will increase on-street parking on Little Casterton Road affecting road safety. (1)
- aa) Object to access off Little Casterton Road. (2)
- bb) Buildings in close proximity to boundary will affect future growth of trees. (1)
- cc) Layout plan does not show trees on nos. 10, 12, 14 and 16 Haddon Road that are a haven for wildlife. (1)
- dd) Design of three storey units unsafe as they only have one entrance/exit. (1)
- ee) Overcrowded development difficult to access for emergency vehicles. (4)
- ff) Loss of trees will affect wildlife habitat. (3)
- gg) Any guarantee that drainage will be adequate and not flood adjoining properties. (2)
- hh) Telecommunications mast adjacent to northern site boundary. Is it safe to locate houses next to it? (1)
- ii) Site should be used to put in place first stage of a ring road or developers should be required to contribute to future provision of such a road. (1)
- jj) Access opposite 49 Little Casterton Road will make it difficult to enter and exit that property. (1)

In addition to the above, a petition with 33 signatures of local residents has been received objecting to the development on the following grounds:

- a) Dominant and oppressive environment created by the proposal especially when viewed in conjunction with additional housing development plans proposed for the area.
- b) Highway safety and traffic impact.
- c) Visually intrusive.
- d) Will result in excessive noise or smell nuisance.
- e) Overlooking and loss of privacy in some instances.
- f) Environmental issues. Drainage to mature trees.
- g) Insufficient notices posted in area. No notices put up in areas most affected.

## **Planning Panel Comments**

To be determined by Committee.

## **Conclusions**

The majority of the objections relate to impact of the proposed development on the surrounding road network and the positioning of the three storey units in relation to existing properties.

The Highway Authority have not taken issue with the traffic likely to be generated by the proposed number of dwellings and improvements to the Scotgate and Casterton Road junctions will have to be undertaken before the development commences.

Rutland County Council are currently considering an application for the relocation of the telecom mast some 500m to the north-east, further into Rutland, of its current position adjacent to the application site.

The applicants are reconsidering parts of the layout where overlooking is a concern. At the time of writing an amended layout is awaited.

The objection by the Environment Agency on contamination grounds is a holding objection. This is likely to be lifted when further information has been submitted addressing their concerns. Again, at the time of writing this report, the additional information is awaited.

Subject to the receipt of satisfactory amendments and further information on contamination, it is considered that the development as proposed conforms to both national planning guidance and the current development plan and, subject to the imposition of relevant conditions, forms an acceptable development.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That subject to the receipt of amended plans satisfactorily addressing concerns about the relationship of three storey units to existing properties and overlooking concerns and the final comments of the Highway Authority and the Environment Agency, the development be Approved subject to condition(s)

1. This consent relates to the application as amended by \*\*\* received on \*\*\*.

## **The reason(s) for the condition(s) is/are:**

1. For the avoidance of doubt.

## **Note(s) to Applicant**

1. You are advised that the application site falls within an area which requires protection from Radon. You are advised to contact the District Council's Building Control Services to ascertain the level of protection required, and whether geological assessment is necessary.

**This application was deferred from the 25 July meeting to allow time for re-consultation on the amended plans received on 25 July 2006.**

Representations on the amended drawings submitted on the 25 July were received from the following:

1. James Brown, 31 Elgar Way.
2. M E Lloyd, 29 Elgar Way.
3. Mr E Wright, 47 Little Casterton Road.
4. Simon Osborne, 16 Ravel Close.
5. D E Carter, 9 Elton Close.
6. Mr P K Jarvis, 49 Little Casterton Road.
7. E Taylor, 1 Gainsborough Road.
8. Mr K A Edwards, 18 Haddon Road.
9. Jane Bateman, 20 Ancaster Road.
10. Malcolm and Pat Callow, 5 Gainsborough Road.
11. Miss Ann Howell, 55 Little Casterton Road.
12. Malcolm Allman, 45 Little Casterton Road.
13. A Denness, 14 Haddon Road.

The issues raised are:

- a) Original report does not properly reflect object (Mr E Wright, 47 Little Casterton Road) – Main entrance to the estate should be opposite Cambridge Road, not opposite 49 Little Casterton Road, as planned. Of three possible options, to have it opposite Cambridge Road is the safest, opposite no. 49 is the most dangerous, and opposite Fitzwilliam Road is less so. (1)
- b) Amendments do not change in impact on 14 Haddon Road – loss of light and oppressive environment. (1)
- c) Lack of employment opportunities locally for residents of proposed dwellings. (1)
- d) Proposed access in dangerous location. Should be opposite Cambridge Road with a roundabout. (2)
- e) Lack of serves in this part of town – will encourage use of motor car. (1)
- f) Insufficient off-street parking for proposed dwellings. (1)
- g) Little Casterton Road and adjoining roads already congested with traffic. (4)
- h) Density still too high. (2)
- i) Concern at the effect on Stamford as a whole. (1)
- j) Dwellings on plots 55-59 and 104-107 are out of character with existing developments. (1)
- k) Mature trees to rear of 18 Haddon Road not shown on layout. (1)

- l) Loss of privacy, sunlight and creation of oppressive environment by proposed dwellings to rear of no. 18 Haddon Road. (1)
- m) Amendments to not address loss of privacy to 1 Gainsborough Road from overlooking from dwellings on Little Casterton Road frontage. (1)
- n) Three storey flats still in same location. (1)

The Town Council commented as follows:

"The Committee's previous comments dated 3 May 2006 still apply – recommend refusal." Further amended plans have now been received and these show the three storey apartment block moved away from the south-east corner of the site, where there were issues in respect of its relationship to existing residential properties, to the north-west.

Other amendments to the original layout are 2½ storey houses on the southern boundary where previously 3 storeys were proposed.

As a result of the amendments, the overall number of houses proposed has been reduced by one, from 183 to 182.

Since the application last appeared on an Agenda, the Highway Authority has confirmed acceptance of the layout and the Environment Agency have withdrawn their objection.

In response to the comments made on the position of the access to the site off Little Casterton Road, the Highway Authority have made the following comments:

1. *The Authority have recently been removing mini-roundabouts due to the number of incidents at them. They also do not assist in pedestrian safety which must be borne in mind, especially in a residential area.*
2. The access arrangements were agreed at outline stage and was designed in accordance with current standards and adopted policies, taking into consideration the road network and internal road network. It is a Distributor Road leading to Belvoir Close.

### **Summary of Reasons for Approval**

See above.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the development be Approved subject to condition(s)

1. This consent relates to the application as amended by drawing nos. 6412/005 Rev H, 6412/009 Rev C, 6412.010 Rev, 6412/011 Rev B, 6412/012 Rev C and 6412/013 Rev B received on 25 August 2006.
2. No development shall take place before the detailed design of the arrangements for surface water drainage has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

and no building shall be occupied before it is connected to the agreed drainage system.

3. No dwellings (or other development as specified) shall be commenced before the first 60 metres of the estate road from its junction with the public highway, including visibility splays, as shown on drawing 6412/005 Rev H received on 25 August 2006 has been completed.
4. Before any dwelling is commenced, all of that part of the estate road and associated footways that forms the junction with the main road and which will be constructed within the limits of the existing highway, shall be laid out and constructed to finished surface levels in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
5. Prior to any works commencing on site, a written report demonstrating that the proposed measures to remediate identified land contamination have been successful should be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
6. Development shall proceed fully in accordance with the mitigation measures (e.g. finished floor levels) set out in the approved Flood Risk Assessment, and the applicant shall confirm completion of the approved scheme within one month thereafter.

The reason(s) for the condition(s) is/are:

1. For the avoidance of doubt.
2. To allow vehicles to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety, and in accordance with PPG13.
3. In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway and the safety of the users of the site, and in accordance with PPG13.
4. In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway and the safety of the users of the site, and in accordance with PPG13.
5. To prevent contamination of controlled waters as a result of development in accordance with PPG23.
6. To reduce the risk and impact of flooding in accordance with PPG25.

\* \* \* \* \*

SU.2 S06/0593/69

Date Received: 24-Apr-2006

Applicant	Mr G Laird 13, Fox Dale, Stamford, PE9 2XA
Agent	Mr Tom Reeve 9, Lea View, Ryhall, Stamford, PE9 4HZ
Proposal	<b>Erection of single storey front extension and raising of roof</b>
Location	<b>13, Fox Dale, Stamford</b>

<b>Site Details</b>	
<b>Parish(es)</b>	<b>Stamford</b>

	Unclassified road Radon Area - Protection required Airfield Zone - No consultation required Drainage - Welland and Nene
--	--

## **REPORT**

### **The Site and its Surroundings**

The application property is a linked detached dwelling situated on a cul-de-sac (Fox Dale) of some 17 other similar dwellings. The property is located close to the end of the cul-de-sac and it part fronts the hammer-head turning area.

The dwellings on the southern side of Fox Dale are similar, each with a broad front elevation and low pitched roof. The dwellings are linked by flat-roofed garages and a strong horizontal fascia board, a feature which is taken across the front elevation of each dwelling.

There are modest front gardens of open plan form but softened by landscaping which has grown up over the approximate 30 year history of the development.

### **Site History**

There is no relevant planning history on this site which is relevant to the consideration of this application.

### **The Proposal**

As originally proposed the application involved the erection of a two-storey front extension, the full width of the front and projecting some 2.8m, together with the raising of the roof to a maximum height (at the ridge) of 8.25m from the current height of 6m.

During the consideration of this proposal the applicant withdrew that proposal and submitted a reduced scheme. The two storey extension has now been reduced to a ground floor front extension. The amount of front extension, 2.8m is as before but the front walls have been inset slightly from the main house walls. A lean-to roof with hipped ends sits under the first floor windows. The proposal to lift the roof as before remains.

Internally the proposal is to provide a breakfast room and enlarged kitchen on the ground floor and a single large room with en-suite facility within the roof space. Other internal changes include a shortening of the garage to provide a re-arranged w.c. area.

### **Policy Considerations**

Policy EN1 – Allows for development proposals that (inter alia) reflect the general character of the area through layout, siting, design and materials.

Policy H6 – Allows for the improvement and extension of dwellings where (inter alia) considerations is given to the impact of the proposal on the form, character and setting of the settlement.

### **Statutory Consultations**

Stamford Town Council:

Commented on the original proposal “The Committee is uncertain of the desirability of such a prominent forward extension on neighbouring houses. Strongly recommend site visit. It is noted that these houses are within an old quarry site”.

Following reconsultation of the amended scheme the Town Council commented: “the Town Council wish to change the decision that the application be rejected”.

Local Highway Authority: No objections.

### **Representations as a result of publicity**

The application has been advertised in accordance with established procedures and letters of representations have been received from the following:

(Original proposal)

1. Mr D Hollins (on behalf of his mother Mrs D Hollins of 15 Fox Dale)
2. Mr K M Barnett, Stirling Road
3. Mr & Mrs A MacKenzie, 51 Stirling Road
4. Mrs J Hunter, 147 Stirling Road
5. Mrs L J Kinealy, 1 Fox Dale
6. Mr & Mrs D Briscoe, 9 Fox Dale
7. Mr P Pond, 6 Fox Dale
8. (indecipherable) 39, Stirling Road
9. Mr A Stanhope, 8 Fox Dale
10. Mrs J Williams, 5 Fox Dale
11. Mrs G M Riley, 18 Fox Dale
12. Mr & Mrs S Allan, 16 Fox Dale
13. Mr & Mrs White, 14 Fox Dale
14. Mr N Kettle, 11 Fox Dale
15. Mr & Mrs A Bloodworth, Stirling Road
16. E Day, 45 Stirling Road
17. Town Councillor J Judge, 8 Brooke Avenue

Following the receipt of amended plans all those making representations were re-consulted. Further letters were received from:

1. Mr & Mrs R Jordan, 20 Fox Dale
2. Mr & Mrs D Brisco, 9 Fox Dale

3. Mrs MacKenzie, Stirling Road
4. Mr & Mrs Kinealy, Fox Dale
5. Mrs G Riley, 18 Fox Dale
6. Mr & Mrs S Allan, 16 Fox Dale
7. Mr P Pond, 6 Fox Dale
8. Mr J Williams, Fox Dale
9. Town Councillor J Judge, 8 Brooke Avenue
10. Mrs D Hollins, 15 Fox Dale
11. Mr & Mrs P White, 14 Fox Dale
12. Mr N Kettle, 11 Fox Dale
13. Mr D Hollins, (on behalf of his mother Mrs D Hollins of 15 Fox Dale)

The following issues have been raised (both initially and following re-consultation of the amended scheme)

13 Fox Dale, Stamford: Summary of Objections received.

Letters received from 16 properties objecting to the original scheme, 11 further representations after receipt of amended plans of which 7 had objected previously.

Summary of objections (not ranked in any way):

- a) Precedent
- b) Boxing in of neighbour
- c) Overwhelm neighbour
- d) Dominant/oppressive
- e) Out of keeping (no 3 storeys in area)
- f) Loss of light
- g) Disturbance from construction
- h) Would cause drainage problems
- i) Overshadowing
- j) No need to increase roof height to resolve a maintenance problem
- k) Property could be extended elsewhere
- l) Increase parking problems
- m) Affect on street scene
- n) Reduce access for service/emergency vehicles
- o) Destroy the “exclusiveness” of the development
- p) Recent high court case is similar
- q) Breaches building line
- r) Contrary to deeds
- s) Loss of front garden
- t) Increased bogus callers
- u) Overhanging gutters
- v) Increased noise
- w) Increased demand on water
- x) Will result in increased council tax banding

In addition to the above objection one representation has been received from Mrs S Norriss of 7 Fox Dale, who supports the proposal on the basis that the new roof may be something she will have to do to resolve the problems of damp.

### **Planning Panel Comments**

4th July 2006 – That the site be the subject of a site visit and then the application be referred to the Development Control Committee. Members carried out a site visit on 19th July 2006.

### **Conclusions**

S.38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The policies set out above are generally persuasive towards house extensions and therefore it is necessary to consider whether the proposal is in conflict with any of the conditional issues raised in the policies or whether any material considerations exist to overturn the policy presumption in favour of the development.

These issues are best considered separately under the following headings: -

#### **Design/Appearance**

The development along the southern side of Fox Dale has seen surprising little change since the estate was built about 30 or 80 years ago. The original concept of detached houses linked by flat-roofed garages with white-painted horizontal fascias has largely prevailed. The proposal, involving a front single-storey extension and the raising of the roof, will clearly disrupt the lines of the street scene. However, the design is itself is acceptable and whilst it will introduce a different element it will not appear as incongruous or out of place to justify a refusal on these grounds.

#### **Affect on amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties**

Application of the “45° rule” (advocated by the Building Research Establishment as a means of finding the effect of development proposals on daylight to neighbouring properties) reveals that the ground floor extension will not materially affect daylight levels. It is unlikely that increasing the roof height will have any significant effects.

#### **Increased incidence of on-street parking**

There are currently two parking spaces at the property, one in the garage and one in the drive. This will reduce to one with the proposed internal changes which reduce the garage to only 3.5m long (i.e. below the length of most cars). The extended dwelling also has the potential to generate more vehicles. Although the adopted local plan has a policy of requiring in effect a total of three off-street car parking spaces for dwellings over 112 sqm (as here) this has been superseded by Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 which states that authorities should no longer have car parking standards requiring a minimum provision.

The existing garage can in any event be converted as proposed without planning permission and occupiers cannot be required to park their cars in them.

There has been no objection to the proposal from the County Highways Authority.

Whilst an element of off-street car parking might arise it is difficult to see what particular harm would arise from that practice, particularly as this is virtually at the head of the cul-de-sac where traffic speeds are very low and there can be no through traffic.

#### Other Matters

The objections have raised many and various other issues some of which, such as being contrary to the terms of the deeds or would result in overhanging gutters, are not planning matters and cannot be taken into account in the determination of the application. Of the remaining matters which have some (limited) relevance the following comments are of relevance.

**Precedent:** The objector(s) argue that because there is such similar development then permission should not be granted. This is not a basis on which an application can be determined. Clearly, if it were then anything new, original, different or innovative would have to be turned away.

No justification for increasing the roof pitch. The objector(s) argue that the existing low-pitched roofs do work and the applicant has not made a case for carrying out the works. Applicants do not have to demonstrate a need to carry out their development proposals.

Neighbours will be 'boxed-in'. The neighbour supported by others, claims that the front extension will result in her property being 'hidden away' in the corner making the property more prone to be the target of thieves and the like. Whilst public security is capable of being a planning matter the relationship here would not be so severe as to cause general concern. In many ways this is down to personal preference – some people preferring a 'hidden' location. In any event the neighbouring property is already hidden to a similar degree by a tree growing on the applicant's fruit garden.

#### **In line with policies, material considerations raised but do not outweigh policies**

The development is in accordance with national and local policies as set out in Planning Policy Guidance Notes and policies H6 and EN1 of the South Kesteven Local Plan. The issues relating to overshadowing, loss of light, being out keeping, affect on-street scene, being dominant and increasing parking problems are material considerations but subject to the conditions attached to this permission are not sufficient in this case to indicate against the proposal and to outweigh the policies referred to above.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the development be Approved subject to condition(s)

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

2. This consent relates to the application as amended by letter and plans received on 2 June 2006.
3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

The reason(s) for the condition(s) is/are:

1. Required to be imposed pursuant to section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. For the avoidance of doubt.
3. To maintain the appearance of the building and in accordance with Policies H6 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.

Note(s) to Applicant

1. You are advised that the application site falls within an area which requires protection from Radon. You are advised to contact the District Council's Building Control Services to ascertain the level of protection required, and whether geological assessment is necessary.

**At the last meeting of the Committee, Members resolved to defer consideration of this application to allow the applicant to consider amending the proposal by re-siting the single storey extension from the front of the dwelling to the rear.**

**This suggestion has been put to the applicant. He is not willing to amend the application and asks the Committee to determine his proposal as submitted.**

There is no change to the recommendation to approve this application.

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicant	<b>Stamford Homes Ltd</b> Ashurst, Southgate Park, Bakewell Road, Orton Southgate, Peterborough, PE2 6YS
Agent	
Proposal	<b>Residential development (121 dwellings)</b>
Location	<b>Wherry Lane, Off, South Road, Bourne</b>

<b>Site Details</b>	
<b>Parish(es)</b>	<p><b>Bourne</b></p> <p>Site adjoins Conservation Area</p> <p>Public footpath crosses site - FP1</p> <p>Public footpath adjoins site</p> <p>A Class Road</p> <p>Demolition of any building - BR1</p> <p>Adjacent Listed Building</p> <p>Site of wildlife interest - WL1</p> <p>Drainage - Welland and Nene</p> <p>EA: Development exceeding 1ha - EA6</p>

## REPORT

### The Site and its Surroundings

The application site is located on the west side of South Road, Bourne and is currently occupied by Wherry's industrial premises, a children's day nursery and a children's play centre. The site is adjacent to residential properties to the south, some open agricultural land to the southwest and west, the listed building of Red Hall to the north along with the fire station premises and a builders yard.

The application site measures 2.46 hectares and is long and narrow in shape, the southern end of which passes under 2 sets of overhead power cables and is adjacent to 2 public footpaths. The site is level and benefits from very dense boundary landscaping on most of its boundaries.

The site adjoins the conservation area and is very close to the town centre when compared to the majority of other new-build development within the town and, from its access point onto South Road is within 460m of the Market Place area. The application site is, in residential terms, a very sustainable area and its redevelopment would clearly be 'brownfield' in character.

### Site History

There is a mixed planning history to the entire site but the applications related to extensions to premises, changes of use and advertisements, all linked into the existing uses of the buildings on the land.

Application S06/0092/12 sought planning permission for the erection of 121 dwellings on the site. This application was discussed at the Development Control Committee on 2

occasions in April of this year and, whilst positively encouraged in planning terms, was refused planning permission on 25 April 2006. Members will be aware that the refusal was based entirely on highway related issues, primarily concerning the access from the site onto South Road. The reason for refusal was as follows:

1. Visibility both north and south from the proposed point of access is substantially below requirements due to the existing carriageway alignment. The junction arrangements proposed does not comply with current standards. It is considered that vehicles entering or emerging from this proposed access will be in conflict with traffic travelling on the A15, a County Class 1 Road, contrary to the interests of highway safety.

The applicants have lodged an appeal against this refusal which, although early days, is currently being considered by the Planning Inspectorate. A date for the Hearing has not yet been set.

### **The Proposal**

In an attempt to address the previous reason for refusal the applicants are now proposing an alternative type of access into the site, allowing for a traffic light controlled junction onto South Road.

Within the site 121 dwellings are proposed, allowing for a mix of development across the site providing detached dwellings, semi's, terraced rows and grouped units of apartments. The range of house types proposed would allow for different dwelling sizes and the provision of affordable housing (Section 106 Agreement).

A central spine road would run the entire length of the site to serve the dwellings. In places 'courtyard' areas and pinch-points would be provided to reduce traffic speeds and to add to the visual interest when travelling through the site. In addition to this areas to the edges of the public highway would be landscaped/tree planted to aid the visual amenity within the site.

On entering the site the existing site access to the builders yard premises to the north would be retained. The road would then feed into a courtyard area, from which a secondary (legal) access would be retained to the rear of the builders yard. The site then opens up in width and would allow for a 3-storey range of apartments to the north of the road and mixed dwellings to the south. The apartments would be site to the east of the children's nursery, which is to remain, and to the south east of the Red Hall, a grade II\* listed building. Car parking for the nursery would be provided to the west of the building as opposed to the east where it currently exists.

The access road then meanders through the remainder of the site, terminating in the main area of open space at the southern end of the site.

The site boundaries are well landscaped and the dense Leylandii screen hedge along the southern boundary is within the application site, and is shown to be removed as part of the development. Other mature trees within the site are to be retained where possible, as shown on the submitted layout plan.

At 121 dwellings the density of the site (2.46ha) equates to 49 dwellings per hectare. This is the upper end of the suggested densities in PPG3 but, as the site is within an urban area and is in close proximity to the town centre, is not considered to be an issue in this instance.

Members will recall that concern was raised when considering the previous application in relation to the provision of the modern 3-storey apartment building in such close proximity to Red Hall. The buildings were originally only 20m apart but submitted amended details showed a re-plan of the apartment buildings to site them further away from Red Hall to reduce any issues of impact on the setting of this grade II\* listed building. This amended siting has been retained as part of this application and it is considered that there will be no detrimental impact on the adjacent listed building.

Members may also recall that discussions were underway with the applicants during the consideration of the previous application in order to ensure that sufficient public open space was provided either within the site or that contributions were made for the upgrade of nearby areas of public open space. The current applications confirms that 3246m<sup>2</sup> of POS can be provided within the site. Confirmation has also been given that the applicants are happy to make a financial contribution to the upgrade of POS within the vicinity, of an equivalent amount to account for the shortfall of 1594m<sup>2</sup>. This approach is considered to be acceptable and would form part of a Section 106 Agreement should planning permission be forthcoming.

### **Policy Considerations**

#### **National Policy**

PPG3 – Housing – Seeks to ensure the development of brownfield sites in sustainable locations, a good mix of house types, sizes and style and advises of development densities of between 30 and 50 per hectare.

PPG3 – Transport – Is mainly focussed on traffic movements and the need to provide sustainable development with good transport links in order to reduce the need to travel by car.

#### **Lincolnshire Structure Plan**

Policy S2 – Location of Development – The development would be in accordance with this policy as the site is within the urban area and is well served by public transport and local facilities.

Policy M6 – Traffic Management and Calming – States that provision shall be made to introduce traffic management where such a scheme would promote road safety.

Policy H2 – Housing on Previously Developed Land – Seeks the provision of a percentage of new housing on previously developed land.

Policy H3 – Density of New Housing Development – Seeks a density of new housing development to achieve an average of 30 dwellings per hectare. The development of this urban site would achieve just fewer than 50 dwellings to the hectare.

### South Kesteven Local Plan

Policy H6 – Housing - Allows for development that (inter alia) has no resultant impact on the form, character and appearance of the settlement. A residential development on this site would not be harmful to the character and appearance of this part of Bourne and seeks to replace centrally located industry and business uses with residential properties. In visual terms the scheme could vastly improve the character of the area.

Policy EN1 – Protection and Enhancement of the Environment – Allows for development that (inter alia) reflects the general character of the area through layout, siting, design and materials.

Policy REC4 – Open Space Provision – Seeks a minimum standard of 40m<sup>2</sup> of public open space (POS) per dwelling on developments of over 100 dwellings – or 4840m<sup>2</sup> for this application. As referred to above a total area of just under 3246m<sup>2</sup> of public open space (POS) is to be provided within the scheme the remainder of which will be off-set with a financial contribution towards the upkeep of nearby areas of POS.

Policy C5 – Conservation – Allows for developments that are not deemed to be detrimental to the setting of a listed building. The buildings would be well distanced from Red Hall and existing landscaping along the boundary would aid in screening the development and reduce any issues of impact on the setting of this grade II\* listed building.

Urban Capacity Study – The consultation document for the urban capacity study highlighted a possible development of 60 dwellings on this site. The formal document of December 2005 suggested a figure of 75 dwellings on the site (at a medium PPG3 density of 40 dwellings per hectare) based on only 80% of the site being developable. This figure would be closer to 100 if 100% of the site were to be developed. At the higher density of 50 dwellings per hectare the current figure of 121 dwellings would be accurate. Bearing in mind the UCS is an advisory document the proposal is not deemed to be contrary to the advice contained therein.

### Planning Gain

A Section 106 Agreement is required for this proposal to ensure the provision of affordable housing (at 31%), the provision and future maintenance of a sufficient area of public open space and a commuted sum for an Educational Contribution to Lincolnshire County Council.

In addition to the above, a further planning gain from the residential development of the site is the removal of un-fettered industrial use of the majority of the site. A residential usage in this location is far better in neighbourly terms than the existing uses of the land.

## **Statutory Consultations**

Bourne Town Council:

Objection:

Bourne Town Council believes that this proposal is contrary to Government Planning Policy (RPG8)

The proposal is out of keeping with the historic character of the area.

Development in such close proximity to the Red Hall, early 17th mansion in red brick and Conservation Area would be damaging to a Grade II Listed Building and Conservation Area. The proposed development would destroy a substantial Greenfield site on this land and would have a detrimental impact on wildlife.

Highways safety and traffic impact: The development's proposed access of the A15 is located very closely to a narrow S-bend. An increase in traffic moving along an already busy and narrow 'A' road, particularly at peak times is likely to be detrimental to highway safety.

The proposal of 121 dwellings is clear over-development of the site and would create an oppressive and dominant environment.

Bourne Civic Society: Comments awaited.

Local Highway Authority: Request the refusal of the planning application for the following reasons:

The junction arrangement proposed onto the A15, a County Class 1 Road is below requirements in respect of design and layout configuration. The arrangement proposed does not comply with current standards. It is considered that vehicles entering or emerging from this proposed access will be in conflict with traffic travelling on the A15, a County Class 1 Road, contrary to the interests of highway safety.

Community Archaeologist: No comments made.

Environment Agency: Notwithstanding that a Flood Risk Assessment was submitted with the proposal an objection is still raised until additional information is provided.

Lincolnshire County Council Footpaths: The definitive line and customary width of the footpath will not be affected by any proposed development.

The Ramblers Association: The development will not affect the public right of way.

Lincolnshire Police: Note to the applicant concerning the lighting, landscaping and boundary details. A condition can be imposed relating to the lighting for areas of shared car parking.

Lincolnshire County Council Education: Request and educational contribution (via a S.106) of £390.495.

English Nature: No objection subject to a condition on any approval relating to nesting birds.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust: No objection subject to a condition on any approval relating to nesting bats or birds.

East Midland Development Agency: Already commented on this proposal in a letter to your Council dated 14th February 2006. We do not wish to make any additional comments on this occasion.

East Midlands Regional Assembly:

This new application falls within the East Midlands conformity criteria. Point 3 in my letter of 2.3.06 still applies. It may be judged that the development affects the setting of a 11\* listed building, in which case, English Heritage would need to be consulted. There does not appear to be provision made, particularly in the communal dwellings, for the provision of facilities for the segregated storage, aggregation and collection of wastes for composting and recycling. I refer you to the Regional Waste Strategy, Policy RWS 7 regarding the existing buildings and hard surfaces etc. The S106 agreement could include consideration of upgrading the legal status, width and surface of the footpath to provide safe, segregated access to local facilities. You may also wish to investigate with the highway authority the

adaptation of the wide verges/footpaths and environmental enhancements on South Road to provide footpath/cycleway links to local facilities and the town centre with associated resource implications. The earlier observations regarding the incorporation of high-energy efficiency standards and potential for local CHP schemes still stand.

### **Representations as a Result of Publicity**

The application has been advertised in accordance with established procedures and representations have been received from the following:

1. Mrs Harwood, 64 Southfields
2. N Hydes, 85 Northorpe Lane, Thurlby
3. J Ropson, 7 Broadway Close
4. J Carvath, 12 Southfields
5. I Morley, 10 Station Avenue, South Witham
6. Stansgate Planning Consultants, on behalf of Bourne United Charities
7. A & M Smith, Ashbrook House, 23a South Street
8. I Robinson, 30 Southfields
9. M Williamson, c/o Jewsons
10. D Main, 10 Southfields

The following issues were raised:

- a) Hazardous access onto South Road, danger to pedestrians and vehicles.
- b) Previous comments on S06/0092/12 still apply.
- c) Inappropriate location.
- d) Density is too high – higher than Urban Capacity Study.
- e) Impact on the listed building of Red Hall.
- f) Pressure on infrastructure, school places etc.
- g) Drastic increase in vehicles onto South Road.
- h) Loss of trees will open up site and result in a loss of privacy.
- i) Damage to boundaries and adjacent gardens.
- j) Footpaths should remain un-diverted and open.
- k) Conflict with vehicles using the Jewsons entrances.
- l) Development contrary to PPG3 and PPG25.
- m) Impact on the Conservation Area.
- n) Flooding issues have not been addressed.
- o) Overlooking and loss of privacy.

### **Planning Panel Comments**

11 July 2006 – The application be determined by the Development Control Committee.

### **Applicants Submissions**

As part of the planning application the applicant's have submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (surface water run-off), which has been assessed by the relevant body (see above) and has been found to lack sufficient information for any formal clearance to be given. In addition to this the applicants have provided an Ecological Assessment, Design Statement, open space calculations, Transport Assessment, a Geo-Environment Investigation report, a preliminary Section 106 Agreement and large-scale details of the proposed access onto South Road.

Additionally on 7th August 2006 a comprehensive report from the Applicant;s Highway Engineers was received highlighting the potential options for vehicular access into the site. This included provision for the retention of the existing junction, the provision of a right turn ghost island, the provision of a mini roundabout or the provision of a traffic signalised junction. A full copy of this report is included as an Appendix to this Agenda.

The Highway Authority have been asked to comment on this report and their views have been requested prior to the Development Control Committee.

In addition to this the following information was received from the applicants on 8 August 2006:

'You will have received a report from Faber Maunsell, our highway consultant, on the various options proposed so far. As you will see, from the reports attached all the solutions are practical but the simple T-junction is still the best option. We have carried out a speed survey and demonstrated the actual speeds are below 30mph (23 and 28 mph) and therefore the visibility is adequate.

We have sought the opinion of another consultant on the approach taken by both Faber Maunsell and Lincolnshire Highways and he concurs with the conclusion that the T junction is the best solution, and that LCC's approach of absolute compliance with standards is untenable and not what the guidance is for. (Hurlstone Partnership letter attached).

To be absolutely sure of our position, we have also consulted TRL, the consultants used by government to formulate standards. Their comments are (submitted to the LPA) accord with the others.'

### **Other Issues**

Key Issues – The key issues for members to consider in the determination of this application are as follows:

1. Access issues and highway safety at the point of access onto South Road
2. Issues of potential flooding due to the increase in surface water on the site.
3. Potential loss of privacy and overlooking.
4. Density.
5. Loss of landscaping and loss of the strong boundary hedges.
6. Impact of the development on the adjacent listed building of Red Hall.
7. Acceptability of 3-storey development within the site.
8. The provision of adequate public open space.

Policy Analysis – The policies that are relevant to this application are listed in the policy section above.

### **Conclusions**

The redevelopment of this site represents a brownfield development, within a sustainable location close to the town centre of Bourne. National planning policies contained in PPG3 are therefore met in this instance.

The site is currently occupied with unrestricted industrial premises, a day nursery and a children's activity centre. The potential 'bad neighbour' use of the site would be removed if planning permission was forthcoming – arguably creating a better residential environment for the adjoining residents to the south. In planning terms the proposal represents a good re-use of the land, in a sustainable location, close to the town centre.

The Highway Authority maintain the opinion that a traffic light controlled junction onto South Road would not be appropriate in this location and would be contrary to the interests of highway safety.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the development be Refused for the following reason(s)

1. The junction arrangement proposed onto the A15, a County Class 1 road, is below requirements in respect of design and layout configuration. The arrangement proposed does not comply with current standards. It is considered that vehicles entering or emerging from this proposed access will be in conflict with traffic travelling on the A15 contrary to the interests of highway safety.
2. The proposed development will allow for a high level of hard surfacing to the entire site, which will exacerbate levels of surface water and potential flooding. Insufficient information has been provided in order to determine how the surface water will be dealt with, to address the concerns of the Environmental Agency, which may give rise to issues of surface water flooding in the future. Without sufficient information to overcome this issue the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of PPG25 - Development and Flood Risk (2001).

**This application was deferred from the Development Control Committee on 22 August 2006 to enable Members to have the following information.**

Speakers: Mrs G Clingo - against  
Mr Wherry & Mr B Maynard

Letter to Councillors:

Lincs Standards are only guidance and do not take into account prevailing conditions and safety benefits of the scheme. These benefits are:

HGV's associated with Wherry's will cease;  
Unrestricted HGV use at the site;  
Remove conflict HGV's and vehicles using playbarn and nursery;  
Significantly improve pedestrian safety by providing a route from the school to the town avoiding the bends.

SKDC Amenities Manager:

Shortfall of POS can be addressed through compensation measures. A LEAP + LAP will be required.

Bourne United Charities:

Highways

The assessment predicts that the residential development would generate peak morning flows of 66 traffic movements and peak evening flows of 70 movements. However, these figures are substantially below predicted trip generation rates provided by TRICS. For a development of 121 dwellings, this predicts that the total weekday traffic movements could be between 8-10 trips per household. Therefore the total traffic movements generated by the site could be between approximately 968 to 1210 trips per day. The peak hour between 1700-1800 hours could generate an inbound flow of 12 per cent of this figure and outbound

flow of 6 per cent. The total peak evening flow of traffic movements could therefore be approximately 218 trips.

### **Impact on the Red Hall**

Despite the amendments to the proposed flats adjacent to the Red Hall, this does not mitigate for the adverse impact it has on this building. The scheme will have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Listed Building for the following reasons:

- The scheme proposes apartments near to the boundary with the Red Hall;
- These are inappropriate in terms of their location, size and scale;
- The scale, size and position of the proposed building will cause an overbearing and claustrophobic relationship with the adjacent Listed building;
- The excessive height and location of the apartments detract from the setting of the adjacent listed building.

Whilst in general that it is better that old buildings are not set apart, but are woven into the fabric of the living and working community it specifically warns that new buildings should be carefully designed to respect their setting, following fundamental architectural principles of scale, height, massing and alignment, and use appropriate materials.

### **Character of the area**

With over 60 dwellings per hectare the scheme is cramped and contrived and represents a gross over-development. The proposed development does not respect or integrate with its surroundings on this edge of town location. Furthermore, the proposals fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or the setting of the Listed Buildings.

This would create a very hard urban edge detrimental to the setting of the Conservation Area and to the amenities of users of the nearby public amenity areas and rights of way.

Lincolnshire County Council Highways:

I refer to the executive summary dated 7 August 2006 and plans regarding various access proposals for the above named site.

The comments made by yourself are noted, however taking each of your proposals in turn I would comment as follows.

#### **Existing Junction Layout**

The visibility splays quoted and the document referred to Places, Streets and Movement for the design of internal residential road and footpath layouts, not for access onto a County Class I Road, the A15. The document to be used is TD42/95 this is a policy of this Council as local highway authority and as such 90m splays are required as previously stated.

#### **Right Turn Ghost Island**

TD42/95 is the correct document to be used in this instance but as previously stated to yourself traffic flows will rise from 856 trips per day at present to 1149 from the proposed new development, a 25% increase in traffic (data taken from your own Transport

Assessment). A high percentage of these movements will occur during either morning or evening peak, hence creating a right turn vehicle hazard at these times which does not exist at present. Due to the above a ghost island right turn lane would be required, but from the designs so far produced this scheme cannot be accommodated within land under your clients control or existing highway limits.

#### Mini Roundabout

The design put forward does not comply with this authority's standards and once again you are quoting a document which is incorrect to use for this type of road and hence would be detrimental to highway safety. Once again you have failed to take into account the change in traffic flow patterns and the disruption of a roundabout in this location.

#### Traffic Signals

The scheme put forward as you are aware once again does not comply with policy standards adopted by this authority.

Whilst some of your proposals do have some benefits the overall impact on the highway network is negative and hence considered by this authority to be detrimental to highway safety, especially where adopted policy standards for design cannot be achieved.

Community Archaeologist: Condition re scheme of works.

#### Letters of Support

Mrs Parker: Will stop lorry noise at 4am, reduce dust and remove high conifers.

Adrian Christmas Solicitors (on behalf of Wherry & Sons):

1. It is a brownfield site.
2. The current mixed use does not sit comfortably with the residential areas to the south. The factory creates noise and dust pollution.
3. Having a play school in the middle of an industrial site is not an ideal environment for the children.
4. By building houses nearer the town centre, this should encourage pedestrian traffic into the town centre, thus encouraging local trade. This should also impact on the future redevelopment plans for the North Street/Burghley Street area.
5. Your Council has already approved plans to redevelop the Hereward centre at Cherryholt Road, to cater for Lets Play and other leisure activities. It makes sense to have all the leisure activities in one place. This site would no longer need to cater for the traffic that goes to the existing Lets Play building.
6. A residential development will remove the heavy goods traffic to the existing factory.
7. By opening up the site for housing, it will improve visual impact for the Well-head Fields, another environmental advantage.

8. Back in 1999 The Bourne Town Centre Management Partnership commissioned a Town Centre Action Plan, which we believe has been adopted. Great emphasis was placed on "townscape". The existing buildings on the Wherry site detract from that plan. Redeveloping this part of Bourne would appear to fit in with the objects of the Action Plan and should enhance the approach to the town centre from the south.

Headmaster of Bourne Grammar School: Understands that within the application there is a proposal for a safer pedestrian route to the town which has obvious benefits.

\* \* \* \* \*

# Agenda Item 6

## AGENDA ITEM 6

Report No: PLA.613

### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

12 SEPTEMBER 2006

---

#### REPORT BY ACTING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SERVICES MANAGER

##### Information relating to development control and other planning activity

##### **TABLE 1 Applications not determined within 8 weeks**

This table, broken down into the four Development Control Zones, lists those applications that have not been determined within the recommended 8 week time period. These applications are listed by application number, registration date, applicant, proposal and location.

The number of applications listed, 66 in total, is similar to the previous Committee (65 applications listed).

##### **TABLE 2 Applications dealt with under delegated powers from 07-25 August 2006**

This table lists those applications upon which decisions have been made under the Powers of the Council Exercisable by Officers (as adopted by the District Council on 12 April 1990), and are set out on Pages 65-67 of the Council Yearbook. Decisions authorised by the Planning Panel are identified.

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SERVICES****Applications not determined within the 8 week statutory period****Report No: 12/06****Date Prepared: 29 August 2006****No of applications over 8 weeks: 66****NORTH RURAL****S05/1030/57/KJC**

Date registered:

27-Jul-2005

No of days: 398

**Mr M Dossa**

Extension to provide additional bedrooms

The Olde Barn Hotel, Toll Bar Road, Marston

**Reason for non-determination:**

Awaiting amended plans

**S05/1269/22/EAB**

Date registered:

16-Sep-2005

No of days: 347

**Mr A G White**

Industrial Development (B1, B2, B8)

Sir Isaac Newton Business Park, Part OS 0062, Bourne Road, Colsterworth

**Reason for non-determination:**

Highways Agency require additional information

**S05/1358/22/MH**

Date registered:

11-Oct-2005

No of days: 322

**Vishal Properties Ltd**

Mixed use development (residential, offices, retail, nursery &amp; workshops)

Colsterworth Industrial Estate, Colsterworth

**Reason for non-determination:**

Chairman/Vice Chairman to approve subject to S106 agreement

**S06/0102/21/KJC**

Date registered:

23-Jan-2006

No of days: 218

**Mr R Cox**

Change of use of agricultural land to garden

15, Welfen Lane, Claypole

**Reason for non-determination:**

Awaiting comments from consultees

**S06/0487/63/MAS**

Date registered:

03-Apr-2006

No of days: 148

**Mr D Rowlands, Iberdrola Renewables Energies**

50m tall, steel meteorological mast

Neslam Farm, Sempringham Fen

**Reason for non-determination:**

Further information received, now subject to consultation and analysis

**S06/0532/46/KJC**

Date registered:

10-Apr-2006

No of days: 141

**Mr & Mrs Rowland**

Proposed garage extension and alterations

The Old Hall, Hall Lane, Brandon

**Reason for non-determination:**

Awaiting amended plans

**S06/0678/42/EAB**

Date registered:  
11-May-2006  
No of days: 110

**Mr E A Cant**

Change of use of agricultural land to car parking  
38, Church Leys, Heydour  
Reason for non-determination:  
Deferred pending decision on Scheduled Monument Consent

**S06/0713/55/KJC**

Date registered:  
16-May-2006  
No of days: 105

**Dr Lawrenson & Dr Pullinger**

Demolition of existing house & surgery and erection of two storey starter flats (18)..  
15 - 17, Winters Lane, Long Bennington  
Reason for non-determination:

**S06/0843/59/KJC**

Date registered:  
12-Jun-2006  
No of days: 78

**Mr & Mrs R J Dowding**

Removal of occupancy cond to allow annexe to be occupied as separate dwelling  
Beechcroft Farm, Normanton on Cliffe  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting consultation period expire

**S06/0846/22/EAB**

Date registered:  
12-Jun-2006  
No of days: 78

**Mr & Mrs Aust**

Double garage, dormer windows to replace rooflights and provision of bow window  
Cedar House, Woolsthorpe Road, Woolsthorpe By Colsterworth  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amendments

**S06/LB/6588/46/KJC**

Date registered:  
10-Apr-2006  
No of days: 141

**Mr & Mrs Rowland**

Proposed garage extension and alterations  
The Old Hall, Hall Lane, Brandon  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amended plans

**S06/LB/6596/05/KJC**

Date registered:  
27-Apr-2006  
No of days: 124

**Anthony John Scarborough**

new openings in curtilage buildings and demolition of tin shed  
Heath Farm, Barkston  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amendments

**S06/LB/6619/70/EAB**

Date registered:  
20-Jun-2006  
No of days: 70

**Stoke Rochford Management**

Reinstatement of first and second floor rooms and reconstruction of roof  
Stoke Rochford Hall, Stoke Rochford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Chairman/Vice Chairman to approve subject to clearance from Secretary of State

## NORTH URBAN

### S01/0426/54/MAS

Date registered:  
05-Apr-2001  
No of days: 1972

### **Mr R D Stafford**

Residential development (renewal)  
Adjacent Bridge End Grove, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting details of flood prevention measures

### S02/0154/35/MAS

Date registered:  
05-Feb-2002  
No of days: 1666

### **Buckminster Estate & Jenkinson Trust**

Residential development, local centre, school, open space,  
roads and bridge  
Poplar Farm, Barrowby Road, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Public Inquiry set for February 2007

### S03/1189/35/PJM

Date registered:  
03-Sep-2003  
No of days: 1091

### **Clinton Cards Plc**

New illuminated fascia and projecting sign  
48a, High Street, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further information

### S03/1190/35/PJM

Date registered:  
03-Sep-2003  
No of days: 1091

### **Clinton Cards Plc**

New shop front  
48a, High Street, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further information

### S03/LB/6083/35/PJM

Date registered:  
03-Sep-2003  
No of days: 1091

### **Clinton Cards Plc**

New shopfront including illuminated fascia and projecting sign  
and removal of staircase  
48a, High Street, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further information

### S05/0788/35/KJC

Date registered:  
09-Jun-2005  
No of days: 446

### **Ben Stanley**

Fascia sign, swing sign and projecting box sign  
Dr Thirsty, 85, Westgate, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amended plans

### S05/1609/35/KJC

Date registered:  
02-Dec-2005  
No of days: 270

### **Mr M DiMeglio**

Change of use from A1 (retail) to A3 (restaurant/snack bars)  
Unit 8, The George Shopping Centre, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amended plans

**S06/0169/35/KJC**

Date registered:  
09-Feb-2006  
No of days: 201

**Mortage Options (Remo) Ltd**

Signage  
4, Finkin Street, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Application to be withdrawn

**S06/0552/35/MH**

Date registered:  
12-Apr-2006  
No of days: 139

**Asset & Facilities Management**

Residential development  
Former Kwiksave Site, Castlegate, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting Archaeological Evaluation

**S06/0775/37/BW**

Date registered:  
30-May-2006  
No of days: 91

**Mr B Challis**

Use of agricultural land as a remote control car track  
PT OS 6950, Gonerby Moor  
Reason for non-determination:  
Applicant has recently responded, information passed to Highways Agency

**S06/0776/37/KJC**

Date registered:  
30-May-2006  
No of days: 91

**Mr J A Jenkinson**

Conversion of redundant barn to office/study  
R/o Development At Highfields, Green Street, Great Gonerby  
Reason for non-determination:  
To be withdrawn

**S06/LB/6547/35/KJC**

Date registered:  
09-Feb-2006  
No of days: 201

**Mortgage Options (Remo) Ltd**

Signage to listed building  
4, Finkin Street, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
To be withdrawn

**SOUTH RURAL****S02/1522/68/KJC**

Date registered:  
15-Nov-2002  
No of days: 1383

**A G White**

Change of use to B1, B2 and B8  
The Fox Garage, A1 North, South Witham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting details of traffic generation

**S04/1509/75/IVW**

Date registered:  
04-Oct-2004  
No of days: 694

**The Proprietor**

Day nursery  
Adj & R/o Pumping Station, Barholm Road, Tallington  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further information

**S05/0855/23/MAS**

Date registered:  
22-Jun-2005  
No of days: 433

**Hay Hampers Limited**

Removal of condition 2 from planning permission  
SK23/0631/89 (retention of windows)  
The Barn, Church Street, Corby Glen  
Reason for non-determination:  
Further amendments required

**S05/1252/58/MAS**

Date registered:  
13-Sep-2005  
No of days: 350

**Alston Country Homes**

Erection of dwelling (substitution of house type)  
Plot 5, East Lane, Morton  
Reason for non-determination:  
Amendments required but subject to other applications

**S06/0815/50/BW**

Date registered:  
06-Jun-2006  
No of days: 84

**Mr N Parmenter**

Erection of timber field shelter  
Paddock R/o 38 Cloven Ends, Langtoft  
Reason for non-determination:  
Change of use of land also involved, separate application now received, applications will be determined together

**S06/0914/68/JST**

Date registered:  
28-Jun-2006  
No of days: 62

**Mr A J White**

Siting of temporary unit for temporary accommodation  
33, Water Lane, South Witham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Negotiations on-going

**S06/0932/68/IVW**

Date registered:  
30-Jun-2006  
No of days: 60

**Mr & Mrs J H Dickinson**

First floor extension  
24, Station Avenue, South Witham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amended drawings

**S06/LB/6620/04/IVW**

Date registered:  
20-Jun-2006  
No of days: 70

**T M Trollope-Bellew**

Alteration of listed building (insertion of flue liners)  
The Old Hall, Barholme  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amended details

**SOUTH URBAN****S00/1124/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
31-Oct-2000  
No of days: 2128

**F H Gilman & Co**

Business Park  
PT OS 2700, Land north of Uffington Road, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Chairman/Vice Chairman to approve subject to Archaeological Evaluation and S106 agreement

**S03/0320/56/MAS**

Date registered:  
16-May-2003  
No of days: 1201

**The Robert Doughty Consultancy Ltd**

Industrial development B1, B2 and B8  
OS 3900, 4800, 5300 & PT OS 7200, Northfield Road, Market Deeping  
Reason for non-determination:  
Pending Local Development Framework

**S03/0580/56/MAS**

Date registered:  
11-Jun-2003  
No of days: 1175

**Messrs R & N Stanton**

Erection of restaurant and takeaway  
Adjacent The Towngate Inn, Peterborough Road, Market Deeping  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting Flood Risk Assessment

**S03/1206/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
05-Sep-2003  
No of days: 1089

**Mr S Haynes**

Erection of garage and verandah  
56, High Street, St. Martins, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amended plan

**S03/LB/6086/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
05-Sep-2003  
No of days: 1089

**Mr S Haynes**

Extension of listed building (verandah and garage)  
56, High Street, St. Martins, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amended drawings

**S04/1455/56/KJC**

Date registered:  
22-Sep-2004  
No of days: 706

**Holland House Nursing Homes**

Erection of 14 sheltered housing units  
Holland House Residential Home, 35, Church Street, Market Deeping  
Reason for non-determination:  
Discussions ongoing - amended plans received

**S04/1463/56/MAS**

Date registered:  
24-Sep-2004  
No of days: 704

**Tesco Stores Ltd**

Extension to superstore  
Tesco Stores Ltd, Godsey Lane, Market Deeping  
Reason for non-determination:  
Chairman and Vice Chairman to approve subject to S106

**S04/1789/56/MAS**

Date registered:  
30-Nov-2004  
No of days: 637

**Wilcox Body Trailers**

Factory unit and offices  
Land Adjacent Wilcox Body Systems, Blenheim Way, Market Deeping  
Reason for non-determination:  
Chairman and Vice Chairman to approve subject to S106  
agreement

**S05/0890/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
30-Jun-2005  
No of days: 425

**Hegarty & Co**

Partial demolition of store, ground floor extensions and internal alterations  
10, Ironmonger Street, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Chairman/Vice Chairman to approve subject to clearance from Secretary of State

**S05/1201/56/MAS**

Date registered:  
05-Sep-2005  
No of days: 358

**Alston Country Homes Limited**

Conversion of 5 barns to dwellings and construction of 2 dwellings  
Towngate Farm House, Towngate West, Market Deeping  
Reason for non-determination:  
English Heritage objects - application to be withdrawn

**S05/1426/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
25-Oct-2005  
No of days: 308

**M Thurlby**

Change of use of former RAFA Club to public house and single storey extension  
The former Royal Air Forces Association, 12, St. Pauls Street, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting comments of English Heritage

**S05/1492/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
08-Nov-2005  
No of days: 294

**Mr & Mrs B Green**

Erection of 3 houses, 1 flat and associated parking and external works  
Land Adj Grafton House, 1, Conduit Road, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting Highways comments on additional information

**S05/1652/69/MAS**

Date registered:  
09-Dec-2005  
No of days: 263

**Croft Commercial Developments Ltd**

Four Class B1 (business) units  
South View Farm, Tinwell Road, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further information

**S05/LB/6435/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
30-Jun-2005  
No of days: 425

**Hegarty & Co**

Partial demolition of store, ground floor extensions and internal alterations  
10, Ironmonger Street, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Chairman/Vice Chairman to approve subject to clearance from Secretary of State

**S05/LB/6461/56/MAS**

Date registered:  
05-Sep-2005  
No of days: 358

**Alston Country Homes Limited**

Conversion of five barns to dwellings and construction of two dwellings  
Towngate Farm House, Towngate West, Market Deeping  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting comments of English Heritage

**S05/LB/6489/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
25-Oct-2005  
No of days: 308

**Mr M Thurlby**

Alteration, partial demolition and extension to listed building  
The former Royal Air Forces Association, 12, St. Pauls Street,  
Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting comments of English Heritage

**S06/0230/12/JJ**

Date registered:  
31-Mar-2006  
No of days: 151

**Mr Twell**

Residential development  
R/o 48-64 Willoughby Road, Bourne  
Reason for non-determination:  
Chairman/Vice Chairman to approve subject to S106  
agreement

**S06/0351/12/MAS**

Date registered:  
08-Mar-2006  
No of days: 174

**Allison Homes Eastern Limited**

Residential development (87 houses and 44 flats), roads and  
ancillary works  
Zones 1 And 2 (Area 3), Elsea Park, Bourne  
Reason for non-determination:  
Highway amendments requested

**S06/0439/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
27-Mar-2006  
No of days: 155

**E Bowman & Sons**

Residential development (outline)  
Land And Premises Of E Bowman & Sons, Cherryholt Road,  
Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Deferred for further information

**S06/0614/12/JJ**

Date registered:  
26-Apr-2006  
No of days: 125

**Mr R Hiblin, c/o Workplace Property Ltd**

Variation of time limit condition of p/p S03/0474 (extension to  
bone mill and change of use to B2)  
The Bone Mill, The Slipe, Bourne  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting contaminated land survey

**S06/0630/12/IVW**

Date registered:  
28-Apr-2006  
No of days: 123

**Bourne Rugby Union Football Club**

Erection of floodlights (6 retrospective and 11 proposed)  
Bourne Rugby Club, Milking Nook Drove, Bourne  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting additional information

**S06/0632/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
02-May-2006  
No of days: 119

**The George of Stamford**

Restoration and conversion of garages into storage and  
workshop facilities for hotel, provision of skip enclosure and  
formation of additional car parking within garden area  
George Hotel, High Street, St. Martins, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting additional information

**S06/0694/12/JJ**

Date registered:  
12-May-2006  
No of days: 109

**HPC (Homes) Ltd**

Erection of storage and packaging warehouse with office  
(revised scheme)  
Part OS 3030, South Fen Road Business Park, South Fen  
Road, Bourne  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting additional information

**S06/0756/12/MAS**

Date registered:  
24-May-2006  
No of days: 97

**Anglia Regional Co-op Society**

Demolition of existing factory unit and erection of 1 no  
foodstore, 4 non-food retail units with service yard and  
associated car parking  
Land off, South Road, Bourne  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amendments

**S06/0765/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
26-May-2006  
No of days: 95

**Jelsons Limited**

Erection of 7 dwellings  
Land Off, Belvoir Close, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further comments from English Nature

**S06/0771/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
26-May-2006  
No of days: 95

**Bex Boutiques Limited**

Illuminated projecting sign  
8, St. Marys Hill, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Negotiations ongoing

**S06/0918/12/JJ**

Date registered:  
29-Jun-2006  
No of days: 61

**M Parker & Sons Ltd**

Erection of four dwellings including demolition of existing  
barns  
40, Main Road, Dyke  
Reason for non-determination:  
Delayed as a result of new computer system

**S06/0919/69/JJ**

Date registered:  
29-Jun-2006  
No of days: 61

**Mr Gurdeep Singh**

Erection of four terraced dwellings  
(R/o 55 & 57 Drift Road), Drift Avenue, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Delayed as a result of new computer system

**S06/0928/69/JJ**

Date registered:  
29-Jun-2006  
No of days: 61

**The Muir Group Housing Association Ltd**

Erection of 8 dwellings (affordable housing)  
(r/o 6-12 Somerby Close), off Green Lane, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Delayed as a result of new computer system

**S06/0929/25/JST**

Date registered:  
30-Jun-2006  
No of days: 60

**Ms C Dandridge**

Parking of commercial vehicle (renewal)  
18, Church Street, Deeping St. James  
Reason for non-determination:  
Negotiations on-going

**S06/0937/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
03-Jul-2006  
No of days: 57

**Moseley Brown Developments**

Erection of five town houses, 2 maisonettes and 1 flat  
6-16, New Town, Water Street, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amendments requested by Highways

**S06/LB/6598/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
02-May-2006  
No of days: 119

**The George of Stamford**

Alterations to curtilage listed building  
George Hotel, High Street, St. Martins, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting additional information

**S06/LB/6609/69/IVW**

Date registered:  
26-May-2006  
No of days: 95

**Bex Boutiques Limited**

Alteration of listed building (illuminated projecting sign)  
8, St. Marys Hill, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Negotiations ongoing

**APPLICATIONS DECIDED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**  
**FROM 07 – 25 AUGUST 2006**

**S05/LB/6455/69**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs K McKay  
Proposal: Alteration of listed building (replacement windows to dormers)  
Location: The Old Salutation, 16, All Saints Street, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 August 2006

**S06/0288/58**

Applicant: Edren Homes Ltd  
Proposal: Erection of two dwellings and associated works  
Location: Land North Of Grove House, The Grove, Hanthorpe  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 August 2006  
\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine

**S06/0327/69**

Applicant: Viyella  
Proposal: Fascia signage (non illuminated)  
Location: 15a, St. Marys Street, Stamford  
Decision: Refused - 08 August 2006

**S06/0706/69**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs C Holt  
Proposal: Dormer windows to dwelling..  
Location: 85, Empingham Road, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 August 2006

**S06/0722/12**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs P Carter  
Proposal: Alterations and extensions to form first floor office with two garages under  
Location: Manor Farmhouse, 34, Main Road, Dyke  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 15 August 2006  
\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine

**S06/0737/76**

Applicant: J Shackell  
Proposal: Removal of existing outbuildings and erection of new garage/rear two storey extension  
Location: Walnut Tree House, 20, Northorpe, Thurlby  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 09 August 2006

**S06/0809/69**

Applicant: Dr & Mrs G Wheatley  
Proposal: Extension to dwelling  
Location: 11, St. Peters Street, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 25 August 2006  
\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine

**S06/0816/69**

Applicant: Mr M Richards  
Proposal: Two storey rear extension to dwelling  
Location: 29, Vine Street, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 25 August 2006

**S06/0828/22**

Applicant: Mr A Lambert  
Proposal: Erection of dwelling  
Location: Land Off Main Street, Colsterworth  
Decision: Refused - 08 August 2006

**S06/0829/06**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs D Harris  
Proposal: Porch to front and study to rear  
Location: 51, High Road, Barrowby, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 07 August 2006

**S06/0833/69**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs M Sharpe  
Proposal: Extensions to dwelling  
Location: Clan Ranald, Casterton Road, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 25 August 2006

**S06/0840/69**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Thornton  
Proposal: Erection of part two-storey side extension to dwelling  
Location: 2, Cottesmore Road, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 08 August 2006

**S06/0853/56**

Applicant: Mr J Shaw  
Proposal: Erection of bungalow and garage  
Location: R/o 26 & 28A, Stamford Road, Market Deeping  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 09 August 2006  
**\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine**

**S06/0868/35**

Applicant: Paul Heard Properties Ltd  
Proposal: Conversion of existing retail premises and first floor flat into 4 no self contained flats  
Location: 1, Victoria Street, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 08 August 2006

**S06/0869/69**

Applicant: Mr T Gosney  
Proposal: First floor extension  
Location: 12, Roxburgh Road, Stamford  
Decision: Refused - 09 August 2006

**S06/0870/12**

Applicant: Swedeponic UK Ltd  
Proposal: Extension to rear and side of existing, glasshouse and formation of earth bank to rear to new extension  
Location: Swedeponic Uk Ltd, Spalding Road, Bourne  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 August 2006

**S06/0877/35**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs M Hough  
Proposal: Two storey extension  
Location: 42, Manchester Way, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 08 August 2006

**S06/0878/35**

Applicant: Gov of St Mary's Catholic Primary School  
Proposal: Erection of 2 metre high security fence to site boundary including 2 pedestrian gates and 2 vehicle access gates  
Location: St. Mary's Catholic Primary School, Sandon Road, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 08 August 2006

**S06/0879/08**

Applicant: Mr D A Johnson  
Proposal: Formation of vehicular access  
Location: 37, Low Road, Manthorpe  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 08 August 2006

**S06/0880/12**

Applicant: Mr T Bannister  
Proposal: Erection of dwelling  
Location: Adj. 24, Bede House Bank, Bourne  
Decision: Refused - 08 August 2006

**S06/0881/63**

Applicant: Mr M F Lingard  
Proposal: Erection of car port  
Location: 1, Pinfold Lane, Pointon  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 August 2006

**S06/0883/12**

Applicant: M H Crofts  
Proposal: Storage, sales and hire of vehicle area (renewal)  
Location: Adj West View, Tunnel Bank Road, Bourne  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 11 August 2006  
**\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine**

**S06/0884/76**

Applicant: Jason Murray Homes Ltd  
Proposal: Erection of carport/garden implement store  
Location: 55, High Street, Thurlby  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 11 August 2006  
**\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine**

**S06/0885/62**

Applicant: Meister Properties Ltd  
Proposal: Conversion of public house to dwelling and conversion of outbuildings from 2 apartments to single dwelling  
Location: Blue Bell, Church Lane, Pickworth  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 10 August 2006  
**\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine**

**S06/0886/56**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Pascoe  
Proposal: First floor extension over existing garage  
Location: 6, Nightingales, Market Deeping  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 09 August 2006

**S06/0888/12**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs R Bostock  
Proposal: First floor rear extension  
Location: 1, Laburnum Close, Bourne  
Decision: Refused - 14 August 2006

**S06/0889/12**

Applicant: Mrs M Manderfield  
Proposal: Single storey rear conservatory  
Location: 28, Lavender Way, Bourne  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 09 August 2006

**S06/0892/35**

Applicant: Miss S J Wells  
Proposal: Erection of sectional concrete garage to replace existing  
Location: 14, Jubilee Avenue, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 08 August 2006

**S06/0894/08**

Applicant: De Vere Hotels & Resorts  
Proposal: Erection of external balconies to 28 first floor bedrooms  
Location: Belton Woods Hotel, Belton  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 08 August 2006

**S06/0896/12**

Applicant: Mrs M Gray  
Proposal: Erection of dwelling  
Location: (R/o 2 Lodge Road), Broadlands Avenue, Bourne  
Decision: Refused - 14 August 2006

**S06/0897/73**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs R Warren  
Proposal: Two storey side extension and conservatory  
Location: 54, High Street, Swinstead  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 15 August 2006

**S06/0898/35**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs S Storey  
Proposal: Two storey rear extension  
Location: 97, Queensway, Grantham  
Decision: Refused - 14 August 2006  
\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine

**S06/0899/05**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs D Sheard  
Proposal: Single storey extension to form utility room  
Location: 36, West Street, Barkston  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 August 2006

**S06/0900/55**

Applicant: J D Wakefield  
Proposal: Agricultural building for use as storage & workshop  
Location: Fendyke Cottage, Valley Lane, Long Bennington  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 10 August 2006

**S06/0901/12**

Applicant: Mrs Wright  
Proposal: New roof & 2nd floor extension to create rooms in roof space  
Location: 1, The Retreat, Bourne  
Decision: Withdrawn - 16 August 2006

**S06/0902/56**

Applicant: Mr J Shaw  
Proposal: Erection of two storey infill extension  
Location: 26, Stamford Road, Market Deeping  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 August 2006

**S06/0903/07**

Applicant: Mr A Copland  
Proposal: Rear extensions to dwelling  
Location: 25, Deeping Road, Baston  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 15 August 2006

**S06/0904/56**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs S Williams  
Proposal: Single storey extension to side of dwelling  
Location: 9, Nightingales, Market Deeping  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 15 August 2006

**S06/0905/35**

Applicant: Mr K Smith  
Proposal: Two storey side extension to dwelling  
Location: 32, Newport Avenue, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 15 August 2006

**S06/0906/64**

Applicant: Mr David Doncaster  
Proposal: Demolition of existing single storey rear extension & erection of two storey rear extension  
Location: 15, Middle Street, Rippingale  
Decision: Refused - 17 August 2006  
**\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine**

**S06/0908/56**

Applicant: J Goodman  
Proposal: Erection of conservatory  
Location: 35, Bramley Road, Market Deeping  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 25 August 2006

**S06/0910/66**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs P McCaul  
Proposal: Extension to front of dwelling (bay window)  
Location: Grovers Cottage, School Lane, Sedgebrook  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 15 August 2006

**S06/0911/35**

Applicant: Mr J Cave  
Proposal: Extension  
Location: 35, Chelmsford Drive, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 August 2006

**S06/0912/12**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs P Fitzgerald  
Proposal: Two storey side and rear extension  
Location: 12, Aykroft, Bourne  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 August 2006  
**\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine**

**S06/0913/35**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs N Brewster  
Proposal: Extension to dwelling and detached garage  
Location: 168, Harlaxton Road, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 18 August 2006

**S06/0915/17**

Applicant: Mrs E Bell  
Proposal: Conversion of barn to dwelling  
Location: 19, High Street, Carlby  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 18 August 2006  
**\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine**

**S06/0916/55**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Pudner  
Proposal: Replacement conservatory  
Location: 8, Drury Park, Long Bennington  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 August 2006

**S06/0917/35**

Applicant: Bradford & Bingley plc  
Proposal: 1 no. non-illuminated fascia sign and 1 no. timber amenity board  
Location: 81, Westgate, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 22 August 2006

**S06/0920/56**

Applicant: P Brown  
Proposal: Rear kitchen extension and alteration to roof over garage  
Location: 8, Meadow Road, Market Deeping  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 15 August 2006

**S06/0921/69**

Applicant: Mr B Raine  
Proposal: Resiting wall and fencing to dwelling  
Location: 12, Meadowsweet, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 09 August 2006

**S06/0925/35**

Applicant: Sportswift t/a Card Factory  
Proposal: Static illuminated fascia signs  
Location: 29, The Pantiles, Isaac Newton Centre, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 22 August 2006

**S06/0926/35**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs L Checkley  
Proposal: Single storey rear extension to dwelling  
Location: 22, Welby Gardens, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 August 2006

**S06/0927/54**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Michelson  
Proposal: Single storey extensions to front, side and rear of existing dwelling, demolition of existing garage and erection of detached double garage  
Location: 14, Harrowby Hall Estate, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 August 2006

**S06/0930/56**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs C Sparkes  
Proposal: First floor extension  
Location: 5, Douglas Road, Market Deeping  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 August 2006

**S06/0931/52**

Applicant: The Muir Group Housing Association Ltd  
Proposal: Residential development (8)  
Location: Land Off, Glen Close, Little Bytham  
Decision: Withdrawn - 23 August 2006  
**\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine**

**S06/0933/69**

Applicant: Marks & Spencer plc  
Proposal: Installation of plant behind mansard roof and screen and insertion of louvres in existing openings in eastern elevation  
Location: 41, High Street, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 August 2006

**S06/0935/35**

Applicant: Grantham Conservative Club  
Proposal: Extension to existing car park area  
Location: Grantham Conservative Club, 50, Castlegate, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 17 August 2006

**S06/0936/35**

Applicant: F W & R Properties  
Proposal: Installation of three roller shutters to front elevation  
Location: Unit 1, Inner Street, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 25 August 2006

**S06/0941/35**

Applicant: Lindpet Properties Ltd  
Proposal: Demolition of garage building and erection of new retail and office building with associated works  
Location: R/o Lindpet House, Conduit Lane, Grantham  
Decision: Refused - 25 August 2006  
**\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine**

**S06/0947/54**

Applicant: Sam Ballaam  
Proposal: Extension to workshop  
Location: Sam Ballaam Motor Engineering, Ruston Road, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 22 August 2006

**S06/0949/35**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs J Kidd  
Proposal: Single storey side/rear extension  
Location: 44, Harrowby Road, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 22 August 2006

**S06/0950/35**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs M Lister  
Proposal: Single storey rear extension  
Location: 2, Cambrian Close, Gonerby Hill Foot, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 22 August 2006

**S06/0953/03**

Applicant: Mr R Jackson  
Proposal: Renewal of planning permission (S01/1129/03)  
Location: Low Park Farm, Aslackby  
Decision: Withdrawn - 10 August 2006

**S06/0957/35, 37**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs R C Bailey  
Proposal: Single storey rear extension  
Location: 35, Grampian Way, Gonerby Hill Foot, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 August 2006

**S06/0958/35**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs M Mapletoft  
Proposal: Extension to dwelling (amended)  
Location: 5, Gorse Road, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 25 August 2006

**S06/0962/12**

Applicant: R Longstaff & Co  
Proposal: Display of non-illuminated wall and fascia signs  
Location: 73B, Abbey Road, Bourne  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 17 August 2006

**S06/0966/63**

Applicant: R W Thorpe  
Proposal: Erection of house and garage  
Location: Land Adjacent Windy Acres, South Side, Millthorpe Drove,  
Millthorpe  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 August 2006

**S06/0973/69**

Applicant: Mr N Clipston  
Proposal: Removal of condition 2 of planning permission S06/0679 (to  
allow garages to be used by others)  
Location: Headlands, New Cross Road, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 August 2006

**S06/0977/41**

Applicant: Vale Garden Houses Ltd  
Proposal: Use of premises for light industrial use (B1) with an element  
of retail sales  
Location: Vale Garden Houses Ltd, Melton Road, Harlaxton  
Decision: Lawful Development - 17 August 2006

**S06/0978/58**

Applicant: Lincolnshire County Council  
Proposal: Erection of single storey extension to school  
Location: Morton C Of E Controlled School, Station Road, Morton  
Decision: Approved - 24 August 2006

**S06/0987/22**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs K Russell  
Proposal: Garage and access  
Location: 28, Bourne Road, Colsterworth  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 August 2006

**S06/0988/35**

Applicant: TK Maxx  
Proposal: Internally illuminated signage  
Location: T K Maxx, Dysart Retail Park, Dysart Road, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 August 2006

**S06/1066/44**

Applicant: Lincolnshire County Council  
Proposal: Retention of existing relocatable classroom unit  
Location: Browns C Of E (aided) School, Sandygate Lane, Horbling  
Decision: Approved - 24 August 2006

**S06/1084/83**

Applicant: Dr C Hale  
Proposal: Erection of detached garage  
Location: Doctors Surgery, Main Street, Woolsthorpe By Belvoir  
Decision: Withdrawn - 15 August 2006

**S06/AG/08/42**

Applicant: Mr W E Guinness  
Proposal: Provision of 2 field shelters  
Location: Land Adj. Bramble Cottage, Oasby  
Decision: Details required - 15 August 2006

**S06/LB/6565/69**

Applicant: Viyella  
Proposal: Non-illuminated fascia sign  
Location: 15a, St. Marys Street, Stamford  
Decision: Refused - 08 August 2006

**S06/LB/6587/69**

Applicant: Manorgrove Estates Limited  
Proposal: Alteration of listed building (internal)  
Location: 15, St. Marys Street, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 August 2006

**S06/LB/6612/69**

Applicant: Dr & Mrs G Wheatley  
Proposal: Extension to listed building  
Location: 11, St. Peters Street, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 25 August 2006  
\* DCSM authorised by Panel to determine

**S06/LB/6621/05**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs D Sheard  
Proposal: Single storey extension to form utility room  
Location: 36, West Street, Barkston  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 15 August 2006

**S06/LB/6622/35**

Applicant: Bradford & Bingley plc  
Proposal: 1 no. non-illuminated fascia sign and 1 no. timber amenity board  
Location: 81, Westgate, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 22 August 2006

**S06/LB/6625/69**

Applicant: Marks & Spencer plc  
Proposal: Alteration of listed building  
Location: 41, High Street, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 August 2006

**S06/LB/6626/69**

Applicant: Mr A Palmer  
Proposal: Alteration of listed building  
Location: 6, Rock Terrace, Scotgate, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 August 2006