

# AGENDA



For a meeting of the
<b>DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE</b>
to be held on
<b>TUESDAY, 1 FEBRUARY 2011</b>
at
<b><u>1.00 PM</u></b>
<b>*PLEASE NOTE TIME OF MEETING*</b>
<b>(THE LATE REPORT WILL BE AVAILABLE IN THE MEMBERS' ROOM FROM 12 NOON)</b>
in the
<b>COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, ST PETERS HILL, GRANTHAM</b>
<b>Beverly Agass, Chief Executive</b>

Committee Members:	Councillors Parkin (Chairman); Adams (Vice-Chairman); Cook; Exton; Mrs Gaffigan; Helyar; Higgs; Holmes; Howard; Sam Jalili; Mrs Jalili; Mrs Kaberry-Brown; Vic Kerr; Scott; Mrs Smith; Turner and Avril Williams
Committee Support Officer:	Malcolm Hall Tel: 01476 406118 <a href="mailto:m.hall@southkesteven.gov.uk">m.hall@southkesteven.gov.uk</a>

**(PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE WILL BE A COMFORT BREAK AT 3.30PM FOR TEN MINUTES)**

**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 4TH JANUARY 2011**

(Enclosure)

**5. PLANNING MATTERS**

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

(Enclosure)

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

Report No. PLA865 by the Acting Lead Professional

(Enclosure)

**7. POPLAR FARM, GRANTHAM - FINALISED SECTION 106 AGREEMENT**

Report PLA863 by the Head of Development and Growth

(To follow)

**8. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT REPORT**

Briefing Paper No.PLA862 by the Planning Enforcement Officer

(Enclosure)

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

# MINUTES

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL  
COMMITTEE  
TUESDAY, 4 JANUARY 2011



---

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Adams (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillor Cook  
Councillor Exton  
Councillor Mrs Gaffigan  
Councillor Holmes  
Councillor Howard  
Councillor Mrs Jalili

Councillor Mrs Kaberry-Brown  
Councillor Vic Kerr  
Councillor Parkin (Chairman)  
Councillor Mrs Smith  
Councillor Turner  
Councillor Avril Williams

## OFFICERS

Acting Lead Professional (2)  
Principal Planning Officer  
Area Planning Officer  
Planning Technician  
Committee Support Officer  
Legal Executive

## OTHER MEMBERS

Councillor Craft  
Councillor Mrs Radley  
Councillor Thompson  
Councillor Wootten  
(In accordance with council procedure rule 24.5, Councillors Thompson and Wootten spoke in connection with application CM1)

---

## 72. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Higgs, Sam Jalili and Scott.

## 73. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none declared.

## 74. MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 7TH DECEMBER 2010

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2010 were approved as a correct record of decisions taken.

## 75. PLANNING MATTERS

*Decision:-*

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

### **PWM1**

Application ref: S10/1946/OUT  
Description: Partial demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of four dwellings  
Location: Land Adjacent to 47 Pond Street, Great Gonerby  
Decision: Refused

Noting comments made during the public speaking session from:-

Robert Hutchinson - objecting

together with comments from the Community Archaeologist, no objection from the Highway Authority or Parish Council, objections from nearby residents, report of site inspection and comments made by members at the meeting.

It was proposed, seconded and agreed that the application be refused for the following reason:-

1. It is considered that by virtue of the layout, density, and substantial alterations to the historic stone boundary wall, the proposed development would be detrimental to the open semi-rural character of this part of the village and would intrude into the setting of grade II listed Elms Farmhouse. Although not itself within the conservation area, the development would be detrimental to its setting by virtue of its close proximity and intrusion into the views both into and out of it.

Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposal would be contrary to national planning policy given in PPS1 (Sustainable Development), PPS3 (Housing), PPS5 (Historic Environment), policies 1, 2, 3, 26 & 27 in the East Midlands Regional Plan and policies SP1, SP2, & EN1 of The South Kesteven Core Strategy.

### **PWM2**

Application ref: S10/2338/FULL  
Description: Application under section 73 of the TCPA 1990 for variation of condition 6 of p/p S09/0488 (removal of caravans)

Location: Pickworth Hall, Folkingham Road, Pickworth,  
Sleaford, NG34 0TJ

Decision: Approved

Noting comments from the Community Archaeologist and representations from a neighbouring resident, report of site inspection and comments made by members at the meeting.

It was proposed, seconded and agreed that the application be approved, subject to the summary of reasons set out by the case officer in the circulated report, and subject also to the following conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission or two years from the approval of the last of the reserved matters, whichever is the later.
2. Details of the reserved matters set out below shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval within three years from the date of this permission:
  - (a) layout;
  - (b) scale;
  - (c) appearance;
  - (d) access; and
  - (e) landscaping.

Approval of all reserved matters shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

3. No development shall commence until final details of the materials to be used in the construction of external walls and roofs have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the agreed materials shall be used in the development.
4. 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 buildings are occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
5. 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.

6. Caravans A, B & C (as shown on drawing 1440.A.1b received 07 December 2010) shall be removed from the site within one month of the occupation of the first dwelling on plots 1, 3 & 4 hereby approved.
7. The dwelling hereby approved on plot 2 shall not be commenced before all the caravans have been removed from the site.
8. Unless otherwise agreed the scheme to be submitted pursuant to Condition 2 above shall be in accordance with the design and principles set out on the indicative drawings 1440.A.2C and 1440.A.1B.

Note(s) to Applicant

1. This road is a private road and will not be adopted as a Highway Maintainable at the Public Expense (under the Highways Act 1980) and as such the liability for maintenance rests with the frontagers.

Applicant to be advised that the committee would expect to see appropriate liaison between the developer and existing residents on the site during the course of the development.

**NB1**

Application ref:	S10/2390/FULL
Description:	Erection of bio mass boiler including 4 kilns, woodchip store and associated hardstanding
Location:	Sewstern Timber Services Ltd, Gunby Road, Sewstern, Grantham, NG335RD
Decision:	Approved

Noting comments made during the public speaking session from:-

David Ball - in support  
David Limb - agent for the applicant

together with no objection from Melton Borough Council, Lincolnshire Heritage, Highway Authority, Planning Policy and Parish Council, comments from Environmental Health, representations from a nearby resident, report of site inspection and comments made by members at the meeting.

It was proposed, seconded and agreed that the application be approved, subject to the summary of reasons set out by the case officer in the circulated report, and subject also to the following conditions:-

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

2. No development shall take place until samples of the materials (including colour of render, paintwork or colourwash) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
3. The bio mass boiler shall only utilise waste material from the existing timber yard and no external waste material shall be brought for processing in the bio mass boiler.
4. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the local planning authority.
5. The parking arrangements shown on the approved plan '030 - 81', dated 01 December 2010 for the parking/turning/manoeuvring/loading/unloading of vehicles shall be available at all times when the premises are in use.
6. This permission relates solely to the application as amended by plans received on 14 December 2010.

Note(s) to Applicant

1. You are advised that the application site falls within an area affected by Radon. You are asked to contact the Council's Building Control section (telephone number 01476 406187) to ascertain the level of protection required and whether a geological assessment is necessary.
2. Please note that this grant of planning permission does not override the need for an Environmental Permit.

**NB2**

Application ref: S10/2559/FULL

Description: Mixed use development incorporating 1 house, 2 flats and 2 shops (alterations to permission S10/0701)

Location: R/o 4, St. Pauls Street, Stamford

Decision: Approved

Noting comments from English Heritage and Lincolnshire Heritage, no objection from the Highway Authority and comments made by members at the meeting.

It was proposed, seconded and agreed that the application be approved, subject to the summary of reasons set out by the case officer in the circulated report, and subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window, dormer window or rooflight other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed without planning permission having first been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.
3. No development shall take place within the application site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
4. No works shall take place until full details of the all proposed joinery works including 1:20 sample elevations and 1:1 joinery profiles have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in strict accordance with the agreed details and maintained as such thereafter.
5. A sample panel of the proposed materials shall be constructed on site, and shall be subject to the approval of the district planning authority prior to work commencing on site. The panel shall show the proposed method of construction including the type of natural stone and its finish, the mortar mixture and the method of coursing to be used in the development. The approved development shall be constructed in accordance with the sample panel as may be approved.
6. The arrangements shown on the approved plan '2009/59 – 3 B', dated 12 November 2010 for the parking/turning/manoeuvring/loading/unloading of vehicles shall be available at all times when the premises are in use.
7. The screening to the rear terrace of flat 1 shall be erected prior to the occupation of the property and shall be retained thereafter in perpetuity.
8. Before the flats are occupied details of the means of screening the rooflights in the rear elevation shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority and implemented before occupation.

**JJ1**

Application ref: S10/1923/MDPO

Description: Discharge of planning obligation relating to the payment of £25,000 towards affordable housing in relation to S106 agreement dated 30 November 2000 attached to p/p S99/1172 and linked to p/p S02/0173/75 by supplemental S106 agreement dated 27 May 2002

Location: Manor Farm & Walnut Farm, Main Road, Tallington, PE9 4RF

Decision: Refused

Noting comments made during the public speaking session from:-

Jonathan Gibbison - applicant.

Members were reminded that this application had been reported to the last meeting when it had been resolved to refuse. However, the applicant had attended the meeting just after the application had been considered, with some additional information. Following discussions with the Acting Lead Professional, Chairman and Vice Chairman it had been agreed that the application would be reconsidered at this meeting with the additional information, and following the public speaking, as noted above. The applicant's comments were copied in full in the report accompanying the agenda.

A member sought clarification of the legal situation, noting that the decision at the last meeting had been to refuse. The Legal Executive confirmed that the committee were able to reconsider the application, as a refusal was a two-part procedure, firstly the decision at the committee and secondly the issue of the appropriate decision notice. In view of the comments made above, the decision notice had not been issued, and therefore the application could quite properly be reconsidered.

Members noted details of the proposal and noted also further comments from the applicant's agent and the original requirements of the Section 106 Agreement.

*(2.02 pm - Councillor Adams left the meeting).*

*(2.05 pm - Councillor Adams returned to the meeting).*

After further comments from members, it was proposed, seconded and agreed that the application be refused for the following reason:-

1. It is the District Council's opinion that the evidence provided by the applicant does not justify the discharge of the S106 requirements relating

to affordable housing in this case. The off-site contribution of £25,000 was required in connection to a full application for 12 dwellings and was requested on the bases of the then housing need situation. The applicants were fully aware and prepared to enter the agreement at that time and there has not been a material change in circumstances since as there still remains a requirement to provide affordable housing in Tallington. Although the policy situation has changed recently the Core Strategy only strengthens the affordable housing requirement by requiring developments of 5 or more dwellings to provide a contribution of 35% towards affordable housing.

*(Councillor Adams asked for it to be recorded that he did not vote on the proposal, as he had not been in the meeting during the entire discussion).*

### **CM1**

Application ref: S10/0142/EIAOL

Description: Sustainable urban extension to Grantham comprising: at least 1000 dwelling houses; a continuing care retirement community; a neighbourhood centre (incorporating a primary school, primary healthcare and community assembly facilities (UCO Class D1) and small scale (maximum 750 sq m) convenience shopping (UCO Class A); Public House/Lodge Hotel; ancillary (formal (playing field/play areas) and informal) open space, including structural landscaping and biodiversity enhancement areas; and access works (including alterations to the A607/Belton Lane junction). Land to the north of Grantham (bounded by the East Coast main railway line, by Belton Lane and High Road (A607), Manthorpe), Lincs

Location: Land north of Grantham bound by railway, Belton Lane/High Road (A607), Manthorpe, Grantham

Decision: Refused

Noting comments made during the public speaking session from:-

Mr A Hopwell - Belton and Manthorpe Parish Council  
Mr R Flack - objecting  
Peter Brown - Nicol Thomas Architects - in support  
Martin Herbert - Brown and Co - agents for the land owners  
Tony Aspbury - agent for the applicant

together with a significant number of documents accompanying the application - a letter in support, an environmental impact assessment, a town planning statement, a statement of community involvement, an "illustrative masterplan", draft heads of terms for a Section 106 Agreement, transport assessment, flood risk assessment, landscape framework and arboricultural survey together with a bat survey report.

Also noted were comments from the East Midlands Regional Assembly, SKDC Grantham for Growth, LCC Planning Policy, the Highway Authority, English Heritage, National Trust (recommending refusal), Natural England, SKDC Conservation, Environmental Protection, The Environment Agency, Anglian Water, Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board, Lincolnshire NHS, LCC Children Services, LCC Adult Social Care, LCC Library and Museums, Housing Solutions, Sport England, SKDC Play Provision, Ministry of Defence - Estates Safeguarding, Lincolnshire Police, Campaign to Protect Rural England, Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and Network Rail together with objections from Belton and Manthorpe and Great Gonerby Parish Councils, objections from the Manthorpe Residents Association, 60 individual letters of objection together with a solicitor's letter representing two further residents, letters in support, report of site inspection and comments made by members at the meeting.

The Acting Lead Professional, in introducing the discussion, took members through all the various documents which had been referred to and which were circulated with the agenda. He also referred to a supplementary report which had been circulated prior to Christmas, and which focused on 5 matters in particular - firstly submissions by the applicants of information and views concerning the reasons for objection, by several consultation respondents to the proposed development on grounds relating to the impact that it would be likely to have on its setting. It also sought to remedy the fact that the applicants had not taken account of several policy documents relevant to these and related matters and also summarised the key points addressed by the applicants in the supplementary design report and revised illustrative masterplan and the responses from various bodies consulted on these documents. Secondly, the addendum addressed the reassessments of the likely impacts of the proposed on the physical setting of the site presented in the supplementary design report which had led to revisions being made to the originally submitted illustrative masterplan. Thirdly, the detailed reasons for refusal were included and fourthly and lastly were letters submitted on behalf of the applicants which were attached in full as Appendix 1 and Appendix 2. Also circulated to members present at the meeting was a further supplementary report which included corrections to the reasons for refusal included in the first supplementary report. The Acting Lead Professional also referred to two late letters which had been received from local residents in relation to traffic problems, overhead cables and sewage matters.

*(The meeting adjourned from 3.11 pm to 3.23 pm).*

The committee heard from two local members, Councillors Thompson and

Wootten, and then the Acting Lead Professional made further comments, during which he showed views of the site and its surroundings and addressed some of the points made during the public speaking session.

Members then discussed the report and comments made in detail, and agreed that the report had reasonable balance, and that with the information available they could make a reasoned and balanced decision taking account of all material considerations. It was then proposed, seconded and agreed that the application be refused for the following reasons:-

1. The application proposal is considered by the Local Planning Authority to be contrary to National Policy in respect of the advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development (including Paragraphs 7 and 8), that to deliver sustainable development decisions must be made within a 'plan-led system, that gives certainty and predictability; with plans being drawn up with community involvement, to present a shared vision and strategy of how the District should develop to achieve sustainable patterns of development; the Local Authority consider the appropriate means for considering the merits of developing this site is in the light of the evidence base underpinning the Core Strategy for South Kesteven, including Urban capacity Studies, Strategic Land Availability assessments, comparative sustainability appraisals, infrastructure requirements and the current 5 year housing land supply.
2. The Local Planning Authority consider that the application proposal is contrary to the Development Plan, comprising the East Midlands Regional Plan and the Core Strategy for South Kesteven, in particular the proposal is not in accordance with policies on strategic housing growth, in particular Policy *SP1 (Spatial Strategy)*, in which it is stated (*inter alia*): "The majority of all new development should be focused upon Grantham to support and strengthen its role as a Sub-Regional Centre. New development proposals shall be considered on appropriate sustainable and deliverable Brownfield sites and appropriate greenfield sites (including urban extensions), sufficient to ensure the achievement of growth targets. Details of specific sites (including urban extension sites) will be included in a Grantham Area Action Plan. ... In all cases planning permission will only be granted on a less sustainable site where it has been proven that there are no other more sustainable options available or there are other overriding material considerations. All cases will also be subject to all relevant policies within the remainder of the core strategy or other relevant development plan documents. ...". Furthermore it is considered that there is no overriding strategic policy justification for this North Grantham/Manthorpe application site to come forward for development at this time and that the Core Strategy should be given more weight than any other material consideration.
3. It is considered by the Local Planning Authority that the development of

the application site would be premature in the context of the fact that the Grantham Area Action Plan DPD is shortly to be consulted upon and is scheduled to be adopted within the next year; in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, notwithstanding the fact that weight must be given to the guidance in paragraphs 71 and 72 of PPS3: Housing, in respect of a potential marginal shortfall in a 5 year land supply for South Kesteven District (as measured against the housing growth trajectory for Grantham (shown in the Core Strategy page 42) ), the approval of a housing site of the scale proposed in this application (in the region of a 1000 dwellings), would undermine to a very significant degree the ability to consider a range of options, whereby the most sustainable sites for new housing development in Grantham can be identified and allocated in the Grantham Area Action Plan DPD to achieve an overall sustainable pattern of development. In this regard the development of this North Grantham/Manthorpe application site, is considered to be premature and should be refused.

4. In terms of the criteria for a sustainable urban extension, set out in Policy *H2: Urban Extension Sites (Grantham)*, the Local Planning Authority consider that the application site is not large enough to provide the full range of infrastructure that should be expected from a SUE. Also it is also judged that the site is not as a good location as the adopted SUEs in terms of sustainability, including in terms of transport issues. The proposed development would not provide for any employment land, although there will be some job opportunities created through the CCRC, retailing and commercial uses on the site if these aspects of the proposal are brought forward; whilst if a significant element of 'employment land' were to be included in the development of the site, it is considered that there would be a greater likelihood that more harm would be caused to the local environment than the present proposal, particularly in respect of the likely impact on historic assets.
5. The Local Planning Authority consider that the development of the application site as proposed would be detrimental to the setting, character and appearance of the Grade 1 listed Belton House and Historic Park and Garden and to key views looking in and out of Belton Park and Garden and as such is contrary to policy *EN1 (Protection and Enhancement of Character of District)*: in which it is stated (inter alia). "Development must be appropriate to the character and significant natural, historic and cultural attributes and features of the landscape within which it is situated, and contribute to its conservation, enhancement or restoration." Furthermore, it is considered that the setting of the Grade 1 registered park, would be adversely affected to a significant degree as a result of the development, by reason of the loss of rural character on the approach roads to Belton House and Historic Park and Garden, the introduction of the roundabout at the Belton Road junction, and the adverse impact on the present views across and out of the Park to the surrounding countryside. Accordingly, the proposal does

not comply with relevant planning policies of Development Plan and Regional/National Policy, In particular Policies HE9.1, HE9.2 and HE10.1 of PPS5 and Policies 26 and 27 of the Regional Plan and Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy for South Kesteven.

6. Notwithstanding the data and proposals submitted by the applicant, it is considered that there are significant shortcomings in some of the analysis and the detail provided and that the mitigating measures proposed are not sufficient to demonstrate that the traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development can be accommodated satisfactorily on the highway network. It is therefore considered by the Local Planning Authority that the traffic generated by the proposed development would have an adverse impact on through traffic in Grantham, its approaches and junctions, in particular in the vicinity of the site along the A607 and the roads around the town centre and would be a likely source of unacceptable danger to other users of the highway, particularly because of the heavy volumes of traffic.

#### **76. INFORMATION RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND OTHER PLANNING ACTIVITY**

The Acting Lead Professional submitted his report PLA860 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 planning appeals update.

#### **77. S10/2068 - APPLICATION TO NOT COMPLY WITH A CONDITION OF PLANNING PERMISSION S10/0179 (REQUIRING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A PEDESTRIAN REFUGE, LAND AT THE DRIFT, HARLAXTON)**

The Chairman reminded members that the above application had been refused at the last meeting. Members had asked that a letter be sent to the County Council expressing the Committee's concern that the speed limit through Harlaxton should be reduced to 30 mph. A letter had been sent, and for the information of members he read the reply received from the Area Highways Manager which indicated that the County Council, having been directed by the Government to carry out a review of speed limits on all its A and B roads had in fact already decided to update its speed limit policy and as a result this section of the A607 had recently been assessed and the 50 mph speed limit had been found to be consistent with the requirements of the new speed limit policy. Accordingly the speed limit would remain as it currently stood in accordance with the County Council's adopted policy.

#### **78. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 3.56 pm.

# Agenda Item 5

## **COMMITTEE: 1 FEBRUARY 2011**

<b>NO</b>	<b>PAGE</b>	<b>PROPOSAL AND LOCATION</b>	<b>REC</b>	
JST1	09/2806	1	External canopy to front, Cafe Black, 21 High Street, Stamford	R
PG1	10/1876	5	Erection of classic car storage unit for domestic use, The Old Rectory, Carlby Road, Greatford	AC
PG2	10/2088	11	Retention of 8 floodlights and install 2 portable buildings, Sports Field, Manor Close, Langtoft	AC
PWM1	10/2416	14	Replacement signage, McDonalds Restaurants Ltd, Bridge End Road, Grantham	AC
PWM2	10/2429	18	Ten freestanding signs (various sizes) within curtilage of drive-through restaurant, as above	Split
PWM3	10/2297	22	Erection of three dwellings, 2 Bourne Road, Colsterworth	AC
NB1	10/2477	28	Retention of workshop, Sunnyside Cottage, Edenham Road, Lound	R
FF1	10/2127	32	Change of use of part of farmyard to storage of caravans, Mill Farm, West Street, Barkston	AC
CM1	10/2811	39	Extensions and alterations to dwelling, The Poplars, 19 Village Street, Gelston	AC

## AGENDA ITEM

**Development Control Committee  
1 February 2011**

**JST1 S09/2806/LB**

Target Decision Date: 15-Jan-2010

Applicant	<b>Mr J Harding</b> Cafe Black, 21, High Street, Stamford, PE9 2AL
Agent	
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>External canopy to front</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>Cafe Black, 21, High Street, Stamford, PE9 2AL</b>
App Type	Listed Building Consent
Parish(es)	Stamford

## REPORT

### Reason for Referral to Committee

The application was previously considered by the committee in February 2010.

### The Proposal

The proposal is for Listed Building Consent for the retention of an external canopy to the front elevation of a Grade II\* listed building. The application was deferred at the Development Control Committee of the 23rd February 2010 to allow further consideration by the applicant to install the canopy within the fascia.

### The application site and its surroundings

The building, which is a fine Grade II\* Georgian property, is constructed of stone with a traditional shopfront. It is located in the heart of the town centre and within the Stamford Conservation Area.

The building, which has had large areas of the shopfront painted black, is located in a highly prominent position on the corner of High Street and Ironmonger Street.

### Representations Received

Stamford Town Council: Object as canopy is considered too large for the site.

Historic Buildings Advisor: Object as the proposal is visually intrusive and architecturally out of place thereby detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and the streetscene

Planning Archaeologist: No known sites affected

Local Highways Authority – Request refusal of the proposal as proposal has not been justified to overhang the highway to such and extent

Stamford Civic Society: Object to the canopy as little regards has been given to the canopy architecturally and the fixing details are unsympathetic to the building.

English Heritage: Object as the proposal would damage the architectural and historic interest of the building through harm caused to the architectural importance of the upper storeys, the typical strong architectural division between the upper storeys and the shopfront, and the traditional shop front design.

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

The application was advertised in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement with the closing date for third party objections being 8 January 2010.

Two representations were received, one in support and one objecting to the application. A summary of the material planning considerations raised in the objections are;-

1. Harm caused to the integrity of the building.
2. Disfigurement of historic fabric.
3. Fixings to canopy harm the Ashlar stone .

### **Site History**

S09/1193 – Approval for internal alterations and signage

S09/1195 – Approval for fascia signage

### **Policy Considerations**

National Policy

PPS5 – ‘Planning and the Historic Environment’

Regional Plan Policy

Policy 27 – Historic Environment

South Kesteven Core Strategy

Policy EN1 – Protection and enhancement of the District

## **Key Issues**

Impact to the Grade II\* Listed Building and the Conservation Area

The proposal seeks retrospective consent for the erection of a black canopy with a canopy box installed above the shopfront on the High Street elevation.

The canopy box is fixed by metal plates with bolts directly into the ashlar stone. The fixings for the canopy box is considered unsympathetic to the building and causes physical harm to this area of the primary shopfront.

Since the previous consideration of the proposal in February 2010 the applicant has investigated recessing the canopy box within the fascia but this has obvious structural and financial considerations. He also observes that the present canopy replicates that on the premises in 1922 and wishes to retain the canopy in its present form. A meeting was held on site to see whether the canopy could be lowered in line with the fascia or inserted within the shop fascia. The canopy manufacturers confirmed that both options were not viable solutions due to the weight of the canopy and also potential stress to the structure of the building. If members were minded to approve the application because English Heritage have objected it would need to be referred to the Secretary of State for consideration.

The canopy, which is retractable, provides a covered area for the outdoor seating area which has planning permission. Whilst the High Street has varying forms of signage and other external shop fittings there is little evidence of any canopies of this size. It is considered that the design and size is visually intrusive and architecturally inconsistent with the surrounding shopfronts and is incongruous within the streetscene. Furthermore, its appearance is both detrimental in form to the principal elevation of the listed building and to this part of the Stamford Conservation Area.

It is further considered that acceptance of this proposal is likely to set an unwelcome precedent for similar proposals within the High Street and/or the surrounding area.

## **Crime and Disorder Implications**

The site appears to raise no concerns relating to crime and disorder.

## **Human Rights Implications**

It should be noted that Article 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) will be taken into account in determining this application. It is considered that no other relevant Article will be breached.

**RECOMMENDATION 1:** That the development be Refused for the following reason(s):

1. In the opinion of the local planning authority the canopy for which retrospective consent is sought is visually intrusive and architecturally out of place, and thereby detrimental to the character and appearance of the listed building, this part of the Stamford Conservation Area and the streetscene in general.

Furthermore, the large box that houses the retracted canopy also appears incongruous within its setting and unsympathetic to the existing attractive shopfront.

The application is therefore considered to be contrary to Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5), Policy 27 of the East Midlands Regional Plan (2009) and Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** That enforcement action be authorised to remove the canopy.

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicant	<b>Mr Andy Wood</b> The Old Rectory, Carlby Road, Greatford, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4PR
Agent	Ian Lapsley, Wythe Holland Partnership LLP Unit 6, Messenger Centre, Crown Lane, Tinwell, Stamford, PE9 3UF
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Erection of classic car storage unit for domestic use</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>The Old Rectory, Carlby Road, Greatford, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4PR</b>
App Type	Householder Development
Parish(es)	Greatford

## REPORT

### Application Category

This application is categorised as a 'householder' application.

### Reason for Referral to Committee

This application has been referred to the Development Control Committee at the request of the Councillor Channel.

### The Proposal

The proposal relates to the erection of a single storey building to house the applicant's collection of classic cars (some 35 items).

The L-shaped building, which measures 30m by 30m on the north and eastern elevations, 10m on its south and west elevations and a front glazed elevation on a 20m radius, is to be single storey with the curved frontage facing into the site. The curved element will comprise glazed folding doors with extending solar blinds coloured green. The rear walls are specified as horizontal timber boarding stained black. The building will have a mono pitched roof, which is very shallow, that would incorporate 18 photovoltaic panels positioned at 35 degrees.

### The application site and its surroundings

The Old Rectory is situated on the northern edge of the settlement of Greatford. The dwelling has an extensive garden area with a large garage/outbuilding to the northeast of the property.

A swimming pool is located within the garden area to the east of the outbuilding that has a polyurethane cover and a hard surfaced tennis court, which is surrounded by mesh fencing, is positioned towards the eastern boundary of the site.

Open fields are located to the north, east and south with the access to the main dwellinghouse and a small number of dwellings being situated to the west .

The site falls within the northern edge of the Greatford Conservation Area and within zones 2 and 3 of the Environment Agency's indicative flood plain maps.

There are also a number of trees within the site that are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)

### **Site History**

The site has some site history; however, these applications are not relevant to this application.

### **Representations Received**

Heritage Lincolnshire (Archaeology) – the proposed development does not affect any known archaeological sites.

Local Highway Authority – Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission

Greatford Parish Council – Concerns raised over the size of the proposal and whether further significant development is forthcoming on the site, increase in vehicular movements due to the number of vehicles stored at the site and for their use in shows etc, and noise pollution. The Parish also recommend a condition, if the application is approved, that the external surfaces to the elevations be timber cladding.

Environment Agency – No objections.

Ramblers Association – No Public Rights of Way (PROW) are affected by this proposal.

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

The application has been advertised in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement with the closing date for third party objections being 1 October 2010

Five objections were received. The material planning considerations raised are summarised as follows:-

1. The scale of the proposal is too large to be considered domestic.
2. It would be difficult for the proposal to be effectively monitored by the council.
3. Noise nuisance from traffic.
4. Excessive vehicle movements.
5. Proposal does not protect the natural and historic environment.
6. Precedent may be set.

7. Impact on the Grade II listed building and the Conservation Area.
8. Adverse impact to the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside.
9. Building will have the appearance of a car showroom.
10. Highway safety.
11. Concern over the materials to be used in the construction.

## **Policy Considerations**

Central Government Planning Policy Guidance

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS5 – Planning for the Historic Environment

PPS25 – Development and Flood Risk

PPG13 – Transport

East Midlands Regional Plan (2009)

Policy 27 – Regional Priorities for the Historic Environment

Policy 35 – Regional Approach to Managing Flood Risk

SKDC Core Strategy (2010)

Policy EN1 – Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District

## **Key Issues**

Size, Scale and Design

Incorporation of Sustainable Construction

Impact to Residential Amenity

Protected Trees

Third Party concerns

## **Officer Evaluation**

### Size, Scale and Design

The size of the footprint of the building is large and on plan form it does appear extensive when compared to the footprint of the existing dwellinghouse and the outbuildings on the site; however, factors to consider would be the height of the building, which is set at approximately 3.35m in height, the location within the plot, the existing landscaping within the site, whether the scale is considered of domestic proportions and the impact to the historic assets.

It is considered that the size of the proposal is relatively low key, in terms of height, and the existing line of trees will help assimilate the building into its surroundings. The materials, which are to be conditioned, will also ensure that the proposal remains sympathetic within its setting.

It could be argued that the overall size of the building is beyond that considered to be of domestic proportions; however, the size of the plot will not become overdeveloped.

The design of the proposal appears appropriate, subject to conditions specifying a natural finish to the external elevations and the colouring of the drive/display apron for the vehicles.

It is considered that the proposal will not compromise the setting of the listed building and will have a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

### Sustainable Construction

The proposal includes a number of energy saving solutions encouraging a sustainable form of development. These include the orientation of the glazing to allow for natural sunlight, photovoltaic cells to the roof to generate the power for the building, timber cladding to the elevations and a high level of fabric insulation.

### Residential Amenity

The proposal is situated towards the eastern boundary of the plot away from nearby residential dwellings. It is considered that there will be no adverse impact to occupiers of these dwellings by way of dominance or overlooking.

Concern has been raised over the noise and disturbance issues arising from the traffic generated from the use of the cars and their associated noise; however, the classic cars are to be situated well away from the existing dwellings to the west, the closest of these being in excess of 100m away and the agent has confirmed that this unit is purely for the personal use of the occupier and not for any commercial activity. The cars are at present stored in a warehouse in an adjoining district.

It is therefore considered that there will be little disturbance to the occupants of nearby dwellings.

### Protected Trees

The proposal includes the removal of 9 trees within the site to accommodate the building. There are a number of trees within the site and on the boundary of the site that are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). It should be noted that none of the trees that are to be removed are covered by a TPO.

### Impact on the Grade II listed building and the Conservation Area

The proposal is within the grounds of a Grade II listed building (the Old Rectory) and the Greatford Conservation Area.

It is considered that there will be limited impact of the proposal on the setting of the listed building and that the character and appearance of the Great Greatford Conservation Area would not be harmed.

### Visual Impact

The proposal is situated on the eastern part of the garden area close to the eastern boundary. The building will be relatively 'low key' due to its height and the location. There is also a line of trees providing effective landscaping to the north and east. The Old Rectory will further screen the proposal from views from the west. Views from the south will be across the paddock and the building will be against the backdrop of the mature trees.

It is considered that the visual impact of the proposal will be from distance views and allowing for screening from the existing mature trees on site any detrimental visual harm, on balance, will be minimal.

### Third Party concerns

The principle concerns are related to the size of the development, traffic and the possibility of it being used as a precedent for similar large buildings. The proposal is an exceptional one unlikely to be replicated in that the size of the plot means it does not represent an overdevelopment of the site and in traffic terms the volume of traffic will be very low. Similarly each proposal must be treated on its merits and it is considered that on balance, subject to the proposal being restricted to remain ancillary to the enjoyment of the main dwellinghouse and not to be used for any commercial purposes, the proposal would be appropriate to accommodate the numerous classic cars for the occupants enjoyment.

### Crime and Disorder Implications

It is considered that the proposed development would not give rise to any significant Crime and Disorder Issues.

### Human Rights Implications

Articles 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation.

It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

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

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

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. No development shall take place until samples of the material to be used on the external elevations and used in the construction of the hard surface areas (including colour of the surface) are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

3. The building hereby permitted shall be used for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse known as the Old Rectory and shall not be used for any commercial purposes.

Reason: The introduction of a commercial use in this location is likely to cause undue harm to the private amenities of occupants of nearby dwellings and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy and PPS! Delivering Sustainable Development.

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicant	<b>Mr B Woodthorpe, Langtoft United FC</b> Sports Fields, Manor Close, Langtoft, Peterborough, PE6 9NB
Agent	Mr T Grice, GAA 62, Stamford Road, Easton On The Hill, Stamford, PE9 3PA
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Retention of 8 floodlights and install 2 portable buildings</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>Sports Fields, Manor Close, Langtoft, Peterborough, PE6 9NB</b>
App Type	Full Planning Permission
Parish(es)	Langtoft

## REPORT

### Reason for Referral

The land is owned by the District Council.

### The Proposal

The floodlights have already been installed and are used for training purposes on two evenings a week until 20.30 hrs during the football season. In addition it is proposed to install two portable cabins which will be joined together to form one unit and will be used for additional changing facilities allowing both girls and boys to change and for refreshments, which will be sited adjacent to the existing pavilion.

### The application site and its surroundings

The site is a well established recreation ground with football, tennis and bowling green facilities. It includes a clubhouse and other portable buildings associated with the bowling club activities. The land is adjoined on the southern boundary by housing and on the other three boundaries by open countryside.

### Representations received

Langtoft Parish Council - Use must adhere to terms of the licence agreement with SKDC and not materially impact upon amenity of residents adjoining due to light and noise pollution. Recommend conditions concerning lighting, hours of use, waste from the portacabins appearance, and access to the field for ambulances.

Lincolnshire County Council- Permission should be conditioned to ensure levels of illumination are appropriate.

Archaeology- No observations.

Environmental Protection - Concerned about impact of the lights upon adjoining residents.

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

One letter from resident concerned that application refers to floodlights being installed when they are already there and concerned at appearance of portacabins. (one has already been placed in position).

### **Policy Considerations**

National Policy

PPG 17- Planning for Open Space Sport and Recreation

PPS23- Planning and Pollution Control

PPG24- Planning and Noise

Local policy

Policy EN1 South Kesteven Core Strategy

### **Key Issues**

The principal concern is that of the impact of the lights and associated activities upon adjoining residents. The lights have been in place for at least 12 months and the application was made as a result of a complaint. However only one objection has been made, and this was not concerned with the impact of the lights, and all residents who back onto the sports ground were notified. The lights do need some adjustment to limit the impact of the illumination and a condition has been suggested to address this. Also the amount of usage is restricted to training sessions twice a week during the winter months only and finishing at 2030 hrs. The concerns of the Parish with regard to the terms of the lease has been investigated and confirmation received that the football club are not in breach of the agreement which relates to the management of the pitches.

With regard to the portable buildings they can be painted an appropriate colour and are similar in appearance to two already on site and used by the bowls club.

It is considered that with conditions restricting hours of use for the floodlights and a temporary consent for the portable buildings together with painting the proposal is acceptable and would promote the use of the recreational facilities.

### **Crime and Disorder Implications**

The proposal appears to raise no concerns with regard to crime and disorder.

## Human Rights Implications

No implications.

## SUMMARY OF REASON(S) FOR APPROVAL

It is considered that with the conditions imposed and implemented then the concerns of the public and the Parish Council can be addressed in accordance with Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy and PPS1.

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

1. Within one month of this approval details of the positioning of the floodlights and cowlings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and shall be implemented within one month of the approval of the agreed details and shall be positioned at all times as approved.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of adjoining residents in accordance with Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy and PPG 17 Open Space Sport and Recreation.

2. The buildings hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition on or before 1st February 2016 unless a further permission has been granted by the local planning authority. The buildings shall also be painted a suitable colour, to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, within one month of this approval and shall be retained and maintained as approved at all times.

Reason : A permanent permission would be undesirable in the interests of amenity as the buildings are of a temporary construction.

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicant	<b>McDonalds Restaurant Ltd</b> 11-59, High Road, East Finchley, London, N2 8AW
Agent	Mrs Sarah Carpenter, Planware Ltd The Granary, 37, Walnut Tree Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 1BD
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Replacement signage</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>McDonalds Restaurants Ltd, Bridge End Road, Grantham, NG31 7ES</b>
App Type	Advertisement Consent
Parish(es)	Grantham

## REPORT

### Application Category

This application is categorised as an “other” application.

### Reason for Referral to Committee

This application has been referred to the committee at the request of a Member of the Council as it is considered to be locally controversial.

### The Proposal

This is an advertisement consent application which proposes replacement illuminated signage on the roof of the McDonalds drive through restaurant at Bridge End Road, Grantham. A customer order display sign is also proposed.

This is one of four applications on this site submitted concurrently by the applicant as part of a corporate re branding exercise. Alongside this application, there are two further advertisement applications and a planning application:

S10/2430/ADV - freestanding totem sign

S10/2429/ADV - 10 freestanding signs within the curtilage

S10/2415 - minor extensions/alterations to the building itself

S10/2429/ADV is also to be determined by this committee. The other two have already been determined under delegated powers. S10/2415 was approved and S10/2430/ADV was refused.

## **The application site and its surroundings**

The application site consists of a single storey stand alone McDonalds drive through restaurant and associated car parking and landscaping located on a prominent corner site at a major crossroads. The crossroads is effectively a major gateway into Grantham. The surrounding area is mainly commercial with a transition to residential to the south and east. Most of the surrounding development is low rise – mainly two storey. There is a wooded embankment to the west.

## **Relevant Planning History**

Planning permission was granted for the drive thru restaurant in 2001 and advertisement consent was granted at the same time for the current signage on the building and within the curtilage. Permission was refused for a pole sign.

S01/0387: drive thru restaurant – approved 10 July 2001

S01/1356: various illuminated signage within the curtilage – approved 10 Dec 2001

S01/1357: illuminated roof mounted signs – approved 10 Dec 2001

S01/1358: erection of pole sign (height - 9m, width 4.3m max) – refused 11 Dec 2001. It was considered that the size, nature and level of illumination would form a discordant feature in this prominent location that would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area as a whole.

There have been a number of other proposals for pole signs and monument signs on the McDonalds site which have been refused in recent years, two of which have been dismissed at appeal.

S02/0089: erection of pole sign (height – 7.1m, width 1.9m max) – refused 05 March 2002, appeal dismissed. The reasons for refusal were the same as the previous refusal. The inspector disagreed with the Council's assertion that the sign would lead to an excess of advertisements. However he stated that by virtue of its height and forward position, the sign would be unduly assertive given the well greened and low profile commercial setting in which it would be most immediately seen.

S02/1133: erection of monument sign (height – 3m, width 2.1m max) – refused 08 Oct 2002, appeal dismissed. The reasons for refusal were the same as the previous two refusals. The inspector's reasons for dismissal were broadly similar to the previous dismissal.

S03/0129: erection of monument sign (height – 3.15m, width 1.95m max) – refused 26 March 2003. The reasons for refusal were the same as the previous three refusals.

## **Representations Received**

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

The Highways authority: No observations.

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

None at the time of writing

### **Policy Considerations**

National Policy

Planning Policy Guidance 19 (PPG19): Control of Advertisements

### **Officer Evaluation**

#### **Key Issues**

As this is an advertisement consent application, the only issues that members need to consider are “amenity” and “public safety”

#### Amenity

The roof mounted signs are a replacement for the existing signage. On the the north and east elevations there would be no more than currently exists. It is acknowledged that there would be a modest increase in signage on the western elevation which currently only has two “golden arch” symbols, however given that the signage on this elevation would be seen at an oblique angle from most public viewpoints, it is not considered to be excessive. Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not significantly alter the appearance of the building or be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The customer order display and canopy would be a relatively low key feature and by virtue of its small scale and position close to an existing bus stop and being partially screened by a hedge would not be detrimental to the streetscene. Taking the above into account it is considered that by virtue of the scale, design, siting and level of illumination, the proposal would be in keeping with the existing building and streetscene.

#### Public Safety

It is not considered that the signage would be detrimental to either highway or pedestrian safety.

#### **Crime and Disorder Implications**

The application will not raise any significant issues.

## Human Rights Implications

Articles 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation.

It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

## SUMMARY OF REASON(S) FOR APPROVAL

It is considered that by virtue of the scale, design, siting and level of illumination, the proposal would be in keeping with the existing building and streetscene and would not be detrimental to amenity or public safety in accordance with PPG19 (Control of Advertisements). There are no material considerations that indicate otherwise although conditions have been attached.

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

1. This consent shall expire 5 years from the date of this notice.

Reason: To accord with regulation 14(7) of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007.

2. The advertisement(s) hereby granted consent shall not be installed or erected until the existing signs shown on drawing 4432\_1233\_05 rev B have been removed and any damage incurred by removal repaired.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance and character of the area.

3. This permission relates solely to the application as amended by the drawings 4432\_1233\_07 Rev A, 4432\_1233\_09 Rev A & 4432\_1233\_05 Rev B received on 29 Nov 2010.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicant	<b>McDonalds Restaurant Ltd</b> 11-59, High Road, East Finchley, London, N2 8AW
Agent	Mrs Sarah Carpenter, Planware Ltd The Granary, 37, Walnut Tree Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 1BD
Proposal	<b>Ten freestanding signs (various sizes) within curtilage of drive through restaurant</b>
Location	<b>McDonalds Restaurants Ltd, Bridge End Road, Grantham, NG31 7ES</b>
App Type	Advertisement Consent
Parish(es)	Grantham

## REPORT

### Application Category

This application is categorised as an “other” application.

### Reason for Referral to Committee

This application has been referred to the committee at the request of a Member of the Council as it is considered to be locally controversial.

### The Proposal

This is an advertisement consent application which proposes 10 freestanding signs within the curtilage of the McDonalds drive through restaurant at Bridge End Road, Grantham. A number of the signs are similar sized replacements of existing signs, however two large banner signs (width 4.8m, height 2m) on the boundary and an extra directional signs (width 0.6m, height 2.1m) at the entrance would increase the overall amount of signage on site. All the signs would be illuminated with the exception of the banner signs.

This is one of four applications on this site submitted concurrently by the applicant as part of a corporate re branding exercise. Alongside this application, there are two further advertisement applications and a planning application:

S10/2430/ADV - freestanding totem sign

S10/2416/ADV – replacement roof mounted signage and customer order display

S10/2415 - minor extensions/alterations to the building itself

S10/2416/ADV is also to be determined by this committee. The other two have already been determined under delegated powers. S10/2415 was approved and S10/2430/ADV was refused.

## **The application site and its surroundings**

The application site consists of a single storey stand alone McDonalds drive through restaurant and associated car parking and landscaping located on a prominent corner site at a major crossroads. The crossroads is effectively a major gateway into Grantham. The surrounding area is mainly commercial with a transition to residential to the south and east. Most of the surrounding development is low rise – mainly two storey. There is a wooded embankment to the west.

## **Relevant Planning History**

Planning permission was granted for the drive thru restaurant in 2001 and advertisement consent was granted at the same time for the current signage on the building and within the curtilage. Permission was refused for a pole sign.

S01/0387: drive thru restaurant – approved 10 July 2001

S01/1356: various illuminated signage within the curtilage – approved 10 Dec 2001

S01/1357: illuminated roof mounted signs – approved 10 Dec 2001

S01/1358: erection of pole sign (height - 9m, width 4.3m max) – refused 11 Dec 2001. It was considered that the size, nature and level of illumination would form a discordant feature in this prominent location that would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area as a whole.

There have been a number of other proposals for pole signs and monument signs on the McDonalds site which have been refused in recent years, two of which have been dismissed at appeal.

S02/0089: erection of pole sign (height – 7.1m, width 1.9m max) – refused 05 March 2002, appeal dismissed. The reasons for refusal were the same as the previous refusal. The inspector disagreed with the Council's assertion that the sign would lead to an excess of advertisements. However he stated that by virtue of its height and forward position, the sign would be unduly assertive given the well greened and low profile commercial setting in which it would be most immediately seen.

S02/1133: erection of monument sign (height – 3m, width 2.1m max) – refused 08 Oct 2002, appeal dismissed. The reasons for refusal were the same as the previous two refusals. The inspector's reasons for dismissal were broadly similar to the previous dismissal.

S03/0129: erection of monument sign (height – 3.15m, width 1.95m max) – refused 26 March 2003. The reasons for refusal were the same as the previous three refusals.

It is noted that an existing banner sign on the western boundary has been erected without consent. It is not clear how long this sign has been in place. SK Planning Enforcement have been informed.

## **Representations Received**

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

The Highways authority: No observations.

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

None at the time of writing

## **Policy Considerations**

National Policy

Planning Policy Guidance 19 (PPG19): Control of Advertisements

## **Officer Evaluation**

### **Key Issues**

As this is an advertisement consent application, the only issues that members need to consider are “amenity” and “public safety”

#### Amenity

The majority of the proposed signage is a like for like replacement of the existing signage, albeit in slightly different positions and of slightly different design. In the case of the directional signs at the entrance, these would replace a single sign which was granted consent and has since been removed. Overall the abovementioned signs would not significantly alter the character and appearance of the site or surrounding area.

However, the two proposed banner signs on the western and northern boundaries would add a significant amount of extra signage to the most prominent part of the site.

The Council has taken a consistent approach to significant free standing signage forward of the north elevation of the McDonalds premises and along this section of Bridge End Road. It is considered that the circumstances that led to the previous refusals of various pole and monument signs have not materially changed. The character of the area remains broadly the same.

There is a clear transition at the crossroads between the more overtly urban commercial zone of London Road and the lower key greener mixed use area to the south which gradually becomes suburban and residential in character. The proposed banner signs although relatively low in height (2m), when viewed from most public vantage points would create a prominent and visually intrusive feature giving this prominent street frontage a cluttered and untidy appearance when seen against the backdrop of low key commercial

premises, including the well landscaped McDonalds site and the leafy residential area beyond. Furthermore, it is considered that the McDonalds site as a whole cannot accommodate any more signage over and above the other replacement signage proposed for approval without detrimentally affecting the streetscene.

#### Public Safety

It is not considered that any of the signage would be detrimental to either highway or pedestrian safety.

#### Conclusion

Taking the above into account, a split decision is recommended. It is considered that by virtue of the scale, design, siting and level of illumination, the majority of the proposed signs are appropriate and would be in keeping with the site and streetscene. The banner signs would however be unacceptable and visually intrusive features in the streetscene.

#### **Crime and Disorder Implications**

The application will not raise any significant issues.

#### **Human Rights Implications**

Articles 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation.

It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

#### **SUMMARY OF REASON(S) FOR APPROVAL**

It is considered that the 8 x illuminated signs (1 x hero poster sign, 2 x directional signs, 3 x pre sell totem sign, 1 x rotating 2 bay totem sign, 1x gateway sign) are in keeping with the site and streetscene and would not be detrimental to public safety or the amenity of the area. This part of the proposal would therefore be in accordance with national planning policy given in PPG19 (Outdoor Advertisement Control).

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the development be Split decision:

1. It is considered that the two proposed non illuminated banner signs would be unduly prominent and visually intrusive features which would give a cluttered appearance to this prominent street frontage, detrimental to the site and the wider streetscene. This part of the proposal would therefore be contrary to national planning policy given in PPG19 (Outdoor Advertisement Control).

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicant	<b>Mrs S Harding</b> Colsterworth Post Office, 2, Bourne Road, Colsterworth, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5JE
Agent	Mike Sibthorp Planning Logan House, Lime Grove, Grantham, NG319JD
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Erection of three dwellings</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>2, Bourne Road, Colsterworth, Grantham, NG33 5JE</b>
App Type	Outline Planning Consent
Parish(es)	Colsterworth

## REPORT

### Application Category

This application is categorised as a minor application for outline planning permission.

### Reason for Referral to Committee

This application has been referred to the committee at the request of the Lead Professional as it involves development of domestic garden land and is considered to be locally controversial.

### The Proposal

The proposal involves the erection of a terrace of three dwellings on garden land adjacent to number 2 Bourne Road. The application is in outline form but with matters of access, appearance, layout and scale included for consideration. The dwellings would front onto Bourne Road with a gap of 0.4m from the footway grass verge enclosed by railings. Access would be provided from Bourne Road through an archway to off road parking and a turning space at the rear. All the dwellings would have small rear gardens.

### The application site and its surroundings

The site is broadly rectangular in shape and is currently a lawned area which forms part of the curtilage of No 2 Bourne Road. No 2 also contains a single storey building currently used as Colsterworth Post Office within its curtilage immediately to the west of the proposed dwellings. The site is close to the main crossroads of the village where there is a mixture of older higher density, mainly terraced properties abutting the back edge of the pavement and more modern detached properties in fairly spacious plots set further back from the road. The properties immediately to the east and west of the site are all built right up to the pavement. The site slopes down from east to west and is approximately 1m above the level of the road.

## **Site History**

SK.2030/88: erection of bungalow and shared access – this was refused in 1988 due to concerns that it would be overdevelopment of the plot and would leave insufficient amenity space for no 2 Bourne Road. Notwithstanding these reasons given for refusal, it should be noted that national, regional and local planning policy has changed significantly since then, with a much greater emphasis on sustainability and more efficient use of land.

S10/0107: erection of 3 dwellings (outline) – this was withdrawn on officer advice. The applicant was advised to resubmit with more detailed information including sections, external elevations and street elevations.

## **Representations Received**

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

The Highways Authority: No objection subject to conditions

Colsterworth Parish Council: (comments summarised)

1. Concerns about the access given the changes in levels.
2. Highway safety and parking issues.
3. Reduction in amenity space for No 2 Bourne Road.

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

Three neighbour objections at the time of writing this report. The issues raised are summarised below:

1. Visually intrusive.
2. Loss of greenfield site - "Garden grabbing".
3. Loss of view.
4. Concerns over boundary treatment.
5. Highway safety/parking/congestion issues.
6. Overlooking/loss of privacy.
7. Overbearing impact.
8. Loss of light.

## **Policy Considerations**

National Policy

Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1): Sustainable Development

Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3): Housing

Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5): Historic Environment

East Midlands Regional plan (RSS8)

Policy 1: Regional Core Objectives  
Policy 2: Promoting Better Design  
Policy 3: Distribution of New Development  
South Kesteven Core Strategy

Policy SP1: Spatial Strategy  
Policy SP2: Sustainable Communities  
Policy EN1: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District  
Policy H1: Residential Development

## **Officer Evaluation**

### **Key Issues**

This is an outline application with matters of access, appearance, layout and scale included for consideration. The key issues to be considered in this case therefore are:

The principle of development (sustainability)  
The impact on the form and character of the settlement  
Visual impact  
Highway safety/parking  
Neighbours' residential amenities

### **Sustainability**

The application site is within the village of Colsterworth which is classed as a Local Service Centre under the SK Core Strategy and therefore in principle a sustainable location. The thrust of national and regional policy as well as the Core Strategy is that preference should be given to development on brownfield land wherever possible. However, given that there is not likely to be any available brownfield land in Colsterworth and no allocated land remaining it is considered that notwithstanding the recent reclassification in PPS3 of garden land as greenfield land, development of residential garden sites is acceptable in principle subject to other policy considerations. The proposal has a relatively high density and is therefore an efficient use of the land. Taking the above into account it is considered that the proposal in principle, complies with national, regional and local policy on the location of sustainable development.

### **Impact on Form and Character of the Area**

There are a variety of building types and densities in this part of the village, including older terraces built up to the back edge of the pavement. Taking into account the surrounding development, the current openness of the application site is not considered to contribute significantly to the character of the area and its loss would not have a detrimental impact. The proposed terrace would respect the building line on the south side of Bourne Road and would be of a similar scale, density and plot sizes as nearby development. In terms of appearance, the buildings would be of a simple vernacular style, in keeping with the village context and helping to reinforce local distinctiveness (subject to use of appropriate

materials). The half hipped roof on the western elevation would help to soften the impact of the proposal when viewed from the west. Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposal would be of an appropriate appearance as well as being compatible with the form and character of the surrounding development.

### Neighbours' Amenities

Concerns have been raised about potential overlooking, overbearing impact and loss of light. It is considered that the angle of the building in relation to its neighbours, modest scale and good separation distances from adjacent dwellings are sufficient to maintain current levels of privacy and ensure that the development would not be overbearing or detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties. Some concern has been expressed about boundary treatment. This would be addressed at the reserved matters stage when landscaping details are submitted.

### Highways/Traffic

There is considered to be sufficient off road parking and turning space. Some concern has been raised about the steep slope between the application site and the highway. The Highways Authority do not object subject to conditions. On that basis it is considered that there would be no detrimental impact on highway safety, parking or traffic capacity. However, in order to address the concerns raised, the Highways Authority have been asked to provide further clarification about how the access and footpath would work to their satisfaction given the sharp change in level. Any comments received will be reported in the late background papers.

### Amenity Space

Concerns have been raised about the reduction of amenity space of no 2 Bourne Road. The current garden of this property is fairly substantial. If the proposal were to go ahead, the curtilage of no 2 (excluding the post office) would still be fairly large at approximately 3 times the footprint of this property. This is adequate to allow off road parking and a garden area. Furthermore the reduced curtilage would not be dissimilar in size to a number of existing nearby properties and would not be reduced to such an extent as proposed by the scheme refused in 1988. All the proposed dwellings would have small garden areas which are considered to be sufficient for dwellings of this size in a village context.

### **Crime and Disorder Implications**

The application will not raise any significant issues.

### **Human Rights Implications**

Articles 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation.

It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

## **SUMMARY OF REASON(S) FOR APPROVAL**

It is considered that the proposal for a new dwelling within a Local Service Centre would be an efficient use of the land and complies with the sustainability aims of national, regional and local policy.

The proposal is considered to be of appropriate plot sizes, scale, layout and design for the village context which would be in keeping with the built form and character of the surrounding area.

It is considered that the modest scale and adequate separation distance from adjacent dwellings would preserve the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and that there would be no detrimental impact on highway safety.

Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with national planning policy given in PPS1 (Sustainable Development), PPS3 (Housing) and PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas), policies 1, 2 & 3 of the East Midlands Regional Plan and policies SP1, SP2 and EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy. There are no material considerations that indicate otherwise, although conditions have been attached.

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

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission or two years from the approval of the last of the reserved matters, whichever is the later.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Details of the reserved matters set out below shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval within three years from the date of this permission:  
landscaping.

Approval of all reserved matters shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail and to comply with Section 92 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. 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 dwellings are occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To provide a satisfactory appearance by screening rear gardens from public view and in the interests of the privacy and amenity of the occupants of the proposed dwellings and in accordance with PPS1 and Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

4. 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.

Reason: To ensure that surface water run-off from the development will not adversely affect, by reason of flooding, the safety and commerce of the residents of the site.

5. No development shall commence until final details of the materials to be used in the construction of external walls and roofs have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the agreed materials shall be used in the development.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

Note(s) to Applicant

1. Prior to the commencement of any access works within the public highway, you should contact the Divisional Highways Manager on 01522 782070 for application specification and construction information.
2. You are advised that the application site falls within an area affected by Radon. You are asked to contact the Council's Building Control section (telephone number 01476 406187) to ascertain the level of protection required and whether a geological assessment is necessary.

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicant	<b>Mr N Smith</b> Sunnyside Cottage, Edenham Road, Lound, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0LJ
Agent	A M Knight Mouse Cottage, North Fen Road, Glinton, Peterborough, PE6 7JL
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Retention of workshop</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>Sunnyside Cottage, Edenham Road, Lound, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0LJ</b>
App Type	Full Planning Permission
Parish(es)	Toft with Lound & Manthorpe

## REPORT

### Application Category

This application is categorised as a minor application.

### Reason for Referral to Committee

The application is to be determined by the Development Control Committee with it considered to be locally controversial and at the request of the local Councillor.

### The Proposal

The application is for the retention of a workshop in a paddock to the rear of Sunnyside Cottage. It is of timber construction and close to a copse of small trees; access is by a narrow track that runs along the boundary with Manor House Farm/Manor Lodge.

### The application site and its surroundings

Lound is a small hamlet just north of Toft and south west of Bourne. The application site comprises Sunnyside Cottage and land to the immediate west. A drive to access the building runs adjacent to the house and along the northern boundary of a paddock. The workshop is sited close to a small copse near to a dyke. Heading west from Sunnyside Cottage the land slopes down quite significantly. Hedging marks the boundary with Manor House Farm.

The workshop is constructed of timber with a parking area adjacent to its eastern face. The footprint of the building measures 6m by 13m, with a modest store attached. The eave height of the building is 2.5m with a ridge of 3.5m.

## **Site History**

Outline consent was granted for the erection of Sunnyside Cottage in October 1994. Reserved matters approval was granted in August 1996.

There have been no further applications since the property was built.

## **Policy Considerations**

PPS 1: Delivering Sustainable Development  
PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth  
PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas  
PPG13: Transport  
East Midlands Regional Plan – policies 1, 2, 3, 18

Core Strategy – EN1, SP1, E1

## **Representations Received**

Lincolnshire Heritage raises no concern to the application with regard to possible archaeology in the area.

Lincolnshire County Council, as highway authority, does not object to the application but request that if permission is granted it should be a personal permission to the applicant.

Toft cum Lound and Manthorpe Parish Council does not object to the application.

Planning policy note that policy SP1 would look to restrict development in villages and the countryside although certain categories of development such as rural diversification may be considered acceptable. Policy E1 allows for some development in rural area but this would typically be rural diversification projects which would support the local economy and essentially need to be in that location. Consideration would also have to be had to policy EN1 which identifies that development need respect the character of the area and not be detrimental to residential amenity. A consultation document 'Site Allocation and Policies Development Plan Documents' has been produced and policy SAP4 'Business Development in the Countryside (including rural diversification schemes)' identifies that rural enterprise may be supported provided that it meets numerous criteria including being of a scale and use appropriate to the rural location.

The Environmental Health Department does not object to the application subject to a condition restricting the hours of operation to; 08:30 – 17:30 Monday to Friday, 09:00 – 13:00 Saturday and nothing on a Sunday or Bank Holiday.

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

The application has been advertised in accordance with the Councils adopted statement of Community Involvement, the closing date for representations being the 30 November 2010.

Nine letters of objection have been received and express concern about the proposal on a number of levels; Highways, visibility is poor and the number of vehicles accessing the site will increase and be harmful to safety and amenity; located in open countryside the development is inappropriate with no new houses or other such development located in the hamlet; noise and disturbance from the machines and number of people using the workshop; lack of toilets; feel that the retrospective nature of the application is unacceptable; having a detrimental impact on the local environment e.g. flora, fauna, watercourses as well as resulting in a dominant and oppressive impact. Signage for the business is also inappropriate.

## **Officer Evaluation**

It should be noted that when permission was granted for the erection of Sunnyside Cottage, in August 1996, the land to the east of the property where the building is sited was not within the residential curtilage. No application to incorporate the land within the residential curtilage has been approved and it is therefore considered that the workshop is located within open countryside. There is no evidence to suggest that the land outside the curtilage shown on the 1996 application has been used continuously as part of the garden at Sunnyside Cottage (it was not shown as 'blue land' in the 1996 application).

It is not considered that the application would be detrimental to residential amenity through noise that may be generated given the distance to neighbouring properties and insulation of the building. Nor is it considered that the building would result in an overbearing impact. The highway authority raises no objection to the application, subject to it being a personal permission and vehicle movements to the site are likely to be limited.

Whilst policy E1 broadly encourages proposals that are likely to be beneficial to the local economy there is still a need for them to be located in an appropriate location. The application site falls outside of a local service centre and operates from a purpose built structure in open countryside. The scheme is not considered to be a rural diversification project e.g. change of use of redundant agricultural buildings, which may be supported under policy E1. Furthermore, it is not considered essential that the business be in this location with the firm having previously operated from an industrial estate in Empingham.

Policy SP1 identifies that schemes in the countryside will only be considered acceptable, inter alia, for agricultural, forestry or equine development; rural diversification projects and conversion of appropriate buildings. The application is not considered to fall within any of these categories and is therefore not deemed to comply with policy SP1. No exceptional reasons have been put forward with the application to indicate a decision other than in accordance with the Development Plan. Further, though such proposals in each individual case might appear to be unobjectionable, if repeated too often they would undermine national and local policies for the countryside and sustainability.

The visual impact of the building is not considered to be significant given its siting close to a copse and timber construction. Furthermore, as noted above, it is not considered that the proposal would be detrimental to residential amenity. It is therefore considered that, on balance, the development would not be in conflict with policy EN1; that said this would not override the clear conflict with policies SP1 and E1.

In short, the principle of siting a commercial building within open countryside, save for certain specified exceptions and regardless of land ownership, would not be supported and the proposal is considered to be contrary to core strategy policies SP1 & E1.

### **Section 106 Heads of Terms**

No section 106 is required for this application.

### **Crime and Disorder Implications**

The application will not raise any significant issues.

### **Human Rights Implications**

Articles 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation.

It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

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

1. The application site falls within open countryside where development, save for certain specified exceptions, will be restricted. It is not considered essential for the business to be in this location nor would it be deemed a rural diversification project, utilising a purpose built structure. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policies E1 and SP1 of the core strategy; with no other material planning considerations to indicate that the application should be determined otherwise.

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicant	<b>Mr S Elnor</b> Mill Farm, West Street, Barkston, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 2NZ
Agent	Mr J Grundy, JHG Planning Consultancy Ltd Orchard House, Main Road, Welbourn, Lincoln, LN5 0PA
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Change of use of part of farm yard to storage of caravans</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>Mill Farm, West Street, Barkston, Grantham, NG32 2NZ</b>
App Type	Full Planning Permission
Parish(es)	Barkston

## REPORT

### Application Category

This application is categorised as an 'other' application.

### Reason for Referral to Committee

This application has been referred to the committee at the request of the Lead Professional for the Council as it is considered to be locally controversial.

### The Proposal

The proposal is for a change of use of part of a redundant farm yard which would be used to store caravans at Mill Farm in West Street in Barkston. It would utilise the remaining area of derelict farm yard to increase storage capacity.

The proposed storage area is accessible via a private track which also serves the farm. The proposal involves caravan storage for an additional 25 caravan spaces within a small area of a redundant farm yard.

This proposal (S10/2127) is to store caravans externally and this is considered in principle to be an acceptable re-use of farm land which is currently rather untidy and mostly wasted space. The site is rather remote and removed from the built up area of the village and this does not have a visible impact on the surroundings.

The proposed storage area will be secured with a one metre high metal barrier and there will be security gates at the access points. An additional post and rail fence will be erected to separate cattle from the compound. The Highways Department is content with this application and has no objections subject to the conditions and permission was granted for the storage of caravans.

## **The application site and its surrounding**

There is an existing open space associated within Mill Farm which is currently in use. There are various materials and farm equipment stored within this area, which is mainly laid out with compact top soil and is screened by a mature hedge. To the west there are large concrete sections and a wood framed cable shed. There is also an existing farm yard which has livestock.

## **Relevant Planning History**

There were two previous applications S07/0957 and S07/1481 at Mill Farm for the storage of caravan. The S07/0957 application was refused because of its impact on the Highway, after a lengthy consultation between the applicant, the case officer and the Highways Department about the public footpath and accessibility. Additional information was submitted by JHG Planning in an email dated 12th December 2007 and this met the Highway Department's requirements.

Proposed caravans will be stored externally and secured were to a 1m high metal barrier and security gates at the access points.

An additional post and rail fence will be erected to separate cattle from compound boundary to the southerly end. Considered to be an acceptable re-use of farm land which is currently rather untidy and mostly hoisted space. The site is rather remote and removed from the built up area of the village thus not visually impacting on the surroundings. However, S07/1481 (which was submitted later that year) was approved. This was for a change of use of part of farmyard to caravan storage. Additional information was submitted by JHG Planning in an e-mail dated 12th December 2007.

On this occasion, the Highways Department was satisfied with the information the applicant submitted and they raised no objections subject to conditions.

## **Representations Received**

Parish Council: No objections/ observations

Highways Department: No objections subject to conditions

South Kesteven District Council Policy Team: No objection subject to conditions

Environment Protection: No response at the time of writing this report

South Kesteven Consultant Arboriculturalist: No objections/ observations

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust: No objection but offered recommendations

Natural England: No objection but offered recommendations

Rambler's Association: No objections/ observations

## **Representation as a result of publicity**

There was one letter of objection on the following grounds:

Protected Species

Landscape

Traffic movements

Enforcements issues

Previous Planning Application: S07/1481/05

Non planning material considerations

## **Planning Considerations**

National Policy

Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1): Delivering Sustainable Development.

Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4): Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth.

Local Policy

South Kesteven District Council Core Strategy (EN1)

## **Officer Evaluation**

### **Key Issues**

Protected Species

Natural England was initially consulted on 7th October 2010 regarding this proposal. They had concerns that the development would have an impact on bats and nesting birds and pointed out, quite correctly, that 'The protection afforded these species is explained in Part IV and Annex A of Circular 06/2005 ' Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System.' They further re-emphasised ...'that all bat species are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).' Thus Legal protection covers bats and elements of their habitats, as a consequence Natural England objected to the proposed development.

The case officer relayed this point to the applicant and the agent and they responded by producing a 'Protected Species Survey' dated October 2010 which tried to address the issues raised. Natural England replied to this by saying that again but they were wholly satisfied with the report but they left the decision with the case officer as to whether the development should take place. Obviously, this placed the Officer in a difficult position bearing in mind the legal issues if the applicant didn't recognise the merits of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Therefore as a way of resolving this delicate issue, an informative was placed on this application drawing the attention of the applicant and the agents to the protected species legislation.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust also considered the report and concluded that the proposed development should not have any impact on the protected species but recommended that bat and bird boxes should be located on suitable buildings or mature trees around the site.

An objector commented that they, 'have contacted the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and they do not appear to be aware of the above application.' However, in a correspondence dated the 11th January 2011, the objector retracted this statement because they realised that Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust were consulted. They also commented on the Ecology Consultants Report.

#### Landscape

There was an issue that the proposed development would impact on the protected trees which appear to be growing inside or just outside the site boundaries. The Consultant Arboriculturalist was consulted on this matter. The agent responded by stating that there were no trees on site. The applicant insists that a landscaping scheme will be in place. The Consultant Arboriculturalist was satisfied with the response and he wished to make no further comment.

The objector commented that 'the passing place referred to in the report, we believe is an infill of ash and soil. At the point where the public bridle path "junctures" West Street (the report refers to the farm access as farm road) there used to be a small triangular meadow adjoining the hedgerow. This was a most attractive small triangular meadow supporting different species of wild flowers, butterflies and small mammals, including field voles. This has had an amount of ash and soil poured over it and although this appears to have been flattened and compacted, it has not been properly edged. We would ask the question, "Was the small meadow owned by Mill Farm, or was it part of the public bridle path"? We are looking into this point.

#### Traffic Movement / Public Safety

The South Kesteven District Council's policy team was consulted on 7th October 2010. Their initial concern was regarding vehicle movement and any visibility issue. The agent promptly responded that there would be minimal vehicle movement though there would be some delivery and collection of caravans. There would also be screening to address any visibility issues. The Policy Team was satisfied with the response. In addition, PPS4 encourages local support for farm diversification projects.

The Objector felt that 'the new application S10/2127 is not only to extend the caravan parking at Mill Farm, which would compound the problems we are experiencing by potentially increasing the number of caravans, but also to knock down some of the farm buildings..... Mill Farm is in a beautiful setting and has nestled in its surroundings for many years. It is therefore unacceptable that our surroundings and environment should be destroyed in this manner.

#### Enforcement Issues

An objector commented that,' the original application S07/1481/05 was awarded conditional approval, owing to the problems foreseen by the planning committee. One condition was that caravans were restricted as to the times they were to access the site, owing to the narrowness of West Street and the limited access. These times are not being adhered to and we have seen caravans coming and going at all times during the day. This is causing a problem, since the only access route to Mill Farm is the existing public bridle path and farm road. The existing public bridle path appears to have been overlooked by the owner and the planning officer who dealt with the original planning application.' The Enforcement Team is looking into this matter.

The objector felt that,' a second condition was that the area was to be landscaped by trees and bushes and this has not been done. In fact, on studying the original planning application, the new perimeter of the caravan parking area from the adjacent barn was to be 10.3m from the front of the existing barn, but we suggest this has been exceeded. The Enforcement Team is looking into this matter.

#### Planning Application: S07/1481/05

The objector felt that 'the existing public bridle path appears to have been overlooked by the owner and the planning officer who dealt with the original planning application. The application for planning answered Question 6 – "Is the site adjacent to a Public Right of Way" as "No". We suggest this was incorrect.' We are looking into this matter.

#### Non planning material considerations

The objector commented on the proposal, that they know the applicant's father and his reputation in the community, the proposal is unpopular by certain sections of the community, Protected Species Report prepared by Consultants based in California in the USA.

#### **Crime and Disorder Implications**

The application will not raise any significant issues.

## **Human Rights Implications.**

Articles 6 (Right to fair decisions making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been into account in making this recommendation.

It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

## **Summary**

The proposed development has aroused a lot of attention from numerous consultees. The proposed development will be utilising an area of derelict farm yard to increase caravan storage capacity on land that would otherwise be neglected. The current arrangement for traffic entering and leaving the site has been documented and approved by the South Kesteven Planning Policy Team. The proposal accords with the provisions of national policy and the South Kesteven District Council Core Strategy and it should be approved with conditions.

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

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

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Prior to commencement of any works on site relating to the storage of caravans, the works to improve the public highway (by means of passing bays to a full approved specification along with all associated ancillary works) have been completed to the satisfaction of the Area Highways Manager.

Reason: In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway.

3. All movements will be by appointment.  
End users wishing to collect their caravans on site must do so in the morning before 1200 hours  
End users wishing to return their caravans on site must do so in the afternoon after 1300 hours  
(All traffic movement must be adhered to as set out in the JHG Planning Consultancy Ltd's Planning Report dated September 2010)

Reason: In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway.

4. During the landscaping phase appropriate working methods will be carried out in accordance with the submitted application set out in Drawing No F2129-01 dated

August 2010.

The works approved to be carried out within 2 years from the date of consent.

Reason: To safeguard the health and structure of the natural environment.

Note(s) to Applicant

1. You are advised to inform any contractors involved in the (development/demolition/works) of all relevant protected species legislation and in particular the protected status of bats and their roost sites. Work should proceed carefully and care should be taken to ensure that bats are not killed or injured. Should any bats be found, work should cease and the advice of Natural England sought.
2. There should not be any negative impacts on protected species as a result of this development. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust has recommended that consideration is given to include bat and bird boxes on suitable buildings or mature trees around the site.
3. Note to the applicant: No works shall commence on site until a Section 278 Agreement Highways Act 1980 has been entered into with the local highway authority, Lincolnshire County Council to provide passing bays to full approved specification with all ancillary works.
4. Works with the highway shall be arranged in liaison with Lincolnshire County Council Development Directorate.
5. You are advised that the application site falls within an area affected by Radon. You are asked to contact the Council's Building Control section (telephone number 01476 406187) to ascertain the level of protection required and whether a geological assessment is necessary.

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicant	<b>Mr Michael Cooke</b> The Poplars, 19, Village Streets, Gelston, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 2AE
Agent	
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Extensions and alterations to dwelling</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>The Poplars, 19, Village Street, Gelston, Grantham, NG32 2AE</b>
App Type	Householder Development
Parish(es)	Hough on the Hill

## REPORT

### Application Category

This application is categorised as a householder application for full planning permission.

### Reason for Referral to Committee

This application has been referred to the committee as it involves an application by an employee of the District Council.

### The Proposal

The application is for planning permission for two-storey extensions to the rear of the original house and other alterations including the roof and elevational treatment, at The Poplars, Main Street, Gelston. The development applied for has been substantially completed under a planning permission (S06/0486/46) approved by the Development Control Committee on 16 May 2006. This current application has been submitted as the development is not in accord with the plans approved in 2006; the differences between the approved plans and those built and being considered here are detailed below.

### The application site and its surroundings

The application site is broadly rectangular in shape, covering about 0.4 hectares and fronts onto a narrow grassed verge next to a village street at the south east edge of Gelston. The front elevation of the two storey house is close to the edge of the highway and the rest of the front part of the site comprises various outbuildings, the access and extensive parking/storage areas.

There is a domestic property next door to the site, with a white painted two storey house on it, which is located fairly close to the road frontage and on the same building line as the application dwelling. There are three dwellings opposite the application site across the village street.

## **Site History**

S06/0486: extensions and alterations – granted full permission, subject to conditions on 22 May 2006.

## **Representations Received**

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

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

The only neighbour response received at the time of writing this report, was one of no objection.

## **Policy Considerations**

National Policy: Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1): Sustainable Development

East Midlands Regional plan (RSS8): Policy 2: Promoting Better Design

South Kesteven Core Strategy: Policy EN1: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District

## **Officer Evaluation**

### **Key Issues:**

This is an application for changes to an already approved development that has been substantially completed, but is not fully in accordance with the approved plans; the key issues to be considered in this case are judged to be:

The visual impact on the form and character of the original dwelling, the dwelling as approved, the street scene and the character and appearance of the village.

Residential amenity

Impact on Form and Character of the original dwelling, the dwelling as approved, the streetscene and the village

There are a variety of building types and densities in this part of the village, and it is considered that the proposal would not be generally out of keeping with or have a detrimental impact on its surroundings. It is judged that the development as built is of a significantly better design than the original dwelling and that approved in 2006. Though large in scale in overall terms, the extensions are to the rear and though they can be seen from the side close too they do not appear out of keeping with the local street scene.

The extensions and alterations being applied for have been built, but not in accordance with the details shown on the plans approved in 2006. It should be noted that those approved plans were of a poor standard and somewhat sketchy. The overall impact of the dwelling as extended compared with that approved on the form and character of the area are, as just stated, is generally positive. The elevations and outline are more balanced than the original dwelling and the increased height is marginal in terms of any visual impact beyond the very immediate environs, where it is an issue of residential amenity rather than visual impact as such.

The elevations and particularly the openings are considered to be an improvement in design terms to those on the original dwelling and the design approved in 2006; the overall effect is one of better balance aesthetically and better, more traditional detailing.

It is considered, therefore, on design and visual impact grounds, that the proposal is in accordance with the relevant policies of the Core Strategy (EN1) and Regional Plan (Policy 2) and guidance in PPS1.

### Residential Amenity

Concerns were raised in connection with 2006 application about potential overbearing impact and loss of light, particularly in relation to the adjoining property, No. 20 Main Street, Gelston. Now that the extensions have been substantially constructed, it is possible to make a direct assessment of its impact. It is considered that though the west elevation next to No. 20 is a large blank wall, with two gables close to the boundary, the facing wall of No. 20 has no windows to habitable rooms on the facing elevation, while the space between the two dwellings is an access way and not an important area of the garden. Thus levels of privacy are maintained, whilst, although the roof height of the built dwelling is about a metre higher than that approved the overshadowing and overbearing effects are not judged to be materially greater to any significant degree. The occupants of the most affected property (No. 20) have responded to publicity by submitting a letter indicating that they do not object to the development.

Thus in terms of residential amenity the proposal is considered to accord with relevant local and national policies and guidance.

### Summary Reason for Approval

The proposal is in accordance with national and local policies as set out in Planning Policy Statement 1, Policy 2 of the East Midlands Regional Plan and Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy. The issues relating to design, visual impact, impact on residential amenity, materials 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.

### Crime and Disorder Implications

The application will not raise any significant issues.

## **Human Rights Implications**

Articles 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation.

It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

## **SUMMARY OF REASON(S) FOR APPROVAL**

The proposal is in accordance with national and local policies as set out in Planning Policy Statement 1, Policy 2 of the East Midlands Regional Plan and Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy. The issues relating to design, visual impact, impact on residential amenity, materials 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 commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window, dormer window or rooflight other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed without planning permission having first been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and in accordance with the guidance contained in national Planning Policy Statement PPS1.

3. No development shall take place until samples of the materials (including colour of render, paintwork or colourwash) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

Note(s) to Applicant

1. You are advised that the application site falls within an area affected by Radon. You are asked to contact the Council's Building Control section (telephone number 01476 406187) to ascertain the level of protection required and whether a geological assessment is necessary.

\* \* \* \* \*

# Agenda Item 6

## AGENDA ITEM

Report No: PLA. 865

### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

01 FEBRUARY 2011

---

#### REPORT BY ACTING LEAD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

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

##### TABLE 1                    Applications not determined within statutory period

This table, broken down into Major applications and Others, lists those applications that have not been determined within the recommended 13 week (for Majors) or 8 week (for Others) time period. These applications are listed by application number stating a brief reason for the decision not being made.

Applications outstanding (at the date the report was compiled) = 66

##### TABLE 2                    Applications dealt with under delegated powers from 13 December 2010 – 14 January 2011

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 27 October 2006).

##### TABLE 3A                    Outstanding Planning Appeals TABLE 3B                    Appeal Decisions with Summary

This table lists outstanding appeals together with newly submitted appeals and recent decisions accompanied by a summary.

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**  
**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

**Applications not determined within the statutory period**

Report No: 02/2011  
Date Prepared: 17 January 2011  
No of applications over 8 weeks: 66

**MAJOR APPLICATIONS**  
(13 weeks)

**S06/1151/MJNF/JJ**

Date received:  
08-Aug-2006  
No of days: 1623

**Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc**

Construction of non food retail & leisure development  
Former Mirlees Blackstone Site, Uffington Road, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting for applicant to submit amended plans, currently working on scheme

**S07/1267/MJRF/KJC**

Date received:  
13-Sep-2007  
No of days: 1222

**Able Homes Ltd**

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 10 detached dwellings  
53 And R/o 45-59 (incl), Harrowby Lane, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Lead Professional to approve in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

**S08/0780/MJRF/NB**

Date received:  
17-Sep-2008  
No of days: 852

**Mr T Robinson, G S Robinson (Builders)**

Residential development - 14 dwellings and associated parking  
Land Off Stephens Way, Deeping St. James  
Reason for non-determination:  
Lead Professional to approve in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

**S08/1231/EIAOL/PG**

Date received:  
30-Jun-2009  
No of days: 566

Outline permission for residential, community facilities, public open space, sports pitch, railway bridge, roads and ancillary works  
Poplar Farm, Barrowby Road, Grantham, NG31 8AF  
Reason for non-determination:  
Lead Professional to approve in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

**S09/1671/MJRO/RV**

Date received:  
16-Nov-2009  
No of days: 427

**Mr C G Richardson**

Outline: Erection of 8 houses, 6 apartments with 33 ancillary parking spaces.  
Bourne Auction Rooms, Spalding Road, Bourne, PE10 9LE  
Reason for non-determination:  
Lead Professional to approve in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

**S10/1038/MJRO/KJC**

Date received:  
17-May-2010  
No of days: 245

**Springfield Park Property &, Kimberley Developments**

Outline application for residential development  
Springfield Park, Caunt Road, Grantham, NG31 7BG  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting signing of S106, problems contacting LCC

**S10/1204/MJRF/JST**

Date received:  
14-May-2010  
No of days: 248

**Mr B Corr**

Demolition of existing garage depot and erection of 11 town houses (Extension to time for implementation of planning permission S06/1206)  
Fossitt & Thorne, Eastgate, Bourne, PE109LB  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting signing of S106 agreement

**S10/1283/MJRO/KJC**

Date received:  
24-Jun-2010  
No of days: 207

**Mr B Herrod - Planning Manager, Bovis Homes Ltd**

Application Order Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act for residential development (to not comply with Condition 8 of application S05/0220/35 relating to affordable housing)  
Former Impress Factory site, Springfield Park, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Lead Professional to approve in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

**S10/1444/MJRF/KJC**

Date received:  
05-Jul-2010  
No of days: 196

**Mr J Stowbridge, Avery Homes Grantham Ltd**

Application under Section 73 of the Town and County Planning Act for a 65 bed nursing home to vary Conditions 9 and 10 of Planning Permission S07/1365 to provide 3no. additional parking spaces  
37, Beacon Lane, Grantham, NG319DN  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting additional info re impact on trees

**S10/2167/MJNF/PWM**

Date received:  
06-Oct-2010  
No of days: 103

**Mr N Vanstone, PGL Travel Ltd**

Excavation and formation of new activity/rafting lake including landing stages and associated works  
PGL Outdoor Activity Centre, Caythorpe Court, Caythorpe, Grantham, NG32 3EP  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further info

**ALL OTHER APPLICATIONS**  
**(8 weeks)**

**S07/0818/OUT/IVW**

Date received:  
12-Jun-2007  
No of days: 1315

**Dr D Burston**

Erection of Community Health Centre  
The Old Quarry, Castle Bytham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Lead Professional to approve in consultation with  
Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

**S09/1675/FULL/FF**

Date received:  
13-Aug-2010  
No of days: 157

**Mr Andrew Beale, Gonerby Grange Farm**

Change of Use from agriculture to mixed use comprising  
agriculture and storage of commercial vehicles including the  
formation of bunding and erection of 2.0m wire mesh fencing  
and gates  
Gonerby Grange, Belton, Grantham, NG32 2NX  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting determination

**S09/2409/FULL/NB**

Date received:  
15-Oct-2009  
No of days: 459

**Mr T Robinson, G S Robinson (Builders) Ltd**

Residential development (7 dwellings)  
Land Off Stephens Way, Deeping St. James  
Reason for non-determination:  
Chairman/Vice Chairman to approve subject to S106  
agreement

**S09/2827/FULL/JJ**

Date received:  
27-Nov-2009  
No of days: 416

**Mr C Riddle**

Extension to existing dwelling, change of use and extension to  
existing barns to form dwelling and erection of dwelling  
47, East End, Langtoft, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9LP  
Reason for non-determination:  
To be withdrawn

**S09/2829/LB/JJ**

Date received:  
27-Nov-2009  
No of days: 416

**Mr C Riddle**

Extension and alterations of farmhouse, conversion and  
extension and re-build of barn and dovecote  
47, East End, Langtoft, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9LP  
Reason for non-determination:  
To be withdrawn

**S10/0256/FULL/IVW**

Date received:  
09-Feb-2010  
No of days: 342

**Mr J Thorold**

Use of Marston Hall for civil weddings, entertainment  
receptions, guided tours, conferences and use of adjacent  
land for event car parking  
Marston Hall, School Lane, Marston, Grantham, NG322HQ  
Reason for non-determination:  
Deferred for negotiations

**S10/0671/FULL/RV**

Date received:  
09-Mar-2010  
No of days: 314

**Rev P McNee**

Erection of porch gates to church (Revised application)  
St Stephens Church, Church Street, Carlby, Stamford, Lincs  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting withdrawal by applicant

**S10/0857/FULL/NB**

Date received:  
03-Jun-2010  
No of days: 228

**Mr A F Martin**

Siting of temporary mobile home for agricultural worker  
Meadow Farm, King Street, West Deeping, Peterborough,  
PE6 9JE

**Reason for non-determination:**

Awaiting info from agent

**S10/0962/FULL/PL**

Date received:  
13-Apr-2010  
No of days: 279

**Mr Robert Cunniffe**

Change of use of area 1 into garden and change of use of  
areas 2, 3 & 4 to recreational equine land  
Land adjacent to Orchard House, Woolsthorpe Road,  
Woolsthorpe By Colsterworth, Grantham, NG335NT

**Reason for non-determination:**

Awaiting receipt of adjacent applications

**S10/1004/FULL/NB**

Date received:  
20-Aug-2010  
No of days: 150

**Mr B Maynard, Stamford Homes Ltd**

Erection of 3 dwellings (plot substitution to planning  
permission S07/1323)

Wherrys Yard, South Road, Bourne

**Reason for non-determination:**

Lead Professional to approve in consultation with  
Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

**S10/1345/FULL/PWM**

Date received:  
14-Jun-2010  
No of days: 217

**Mr T Tye**

Change of use of agricultural land to mixed use of agriculture  
& storage of hay and straw, and retention of access track and  
hardstanding

Adjacent Ashleigh, Bourne Road, Colsterworth, Grantham,  
NG335JN

**Reason for non-determination:**

Awaiting further info

**S10/1364/FULL/PL**

Date received:  
08-Jun-2010  
No of days: 223

**Mr Stewart Thorpe, S T A S Ltd**

Erection of one dwelling

Ryland Grange Farm, Fulbeck Heath, Grantham, NG32 3HJ

**Reason for non-determination:**

Additional info submitted

**S10/1384/OUT/PWM**

Date received:  
15-Jun-2010  
No of days: 216

**Mr Colin Pask, Pask, Somerville & Diment c/o**

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of six dwellings  
(Extension of time limit of S07/0843)

Sandy Willows, 354, Harlaxton Road, Grantham

**Reason for non-determination:**

Awaiting further info

**S10/1388/HSH/FF**

Date received:  
14-Jun-2010  
No of days: 217

**Miss H Robertshaw**

Extensions and alterations to dwelling and alterations to  
garage/store and installation of solar PV panels (amendments  
to S07/0378)

7, Broad Street, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 8AP

**Reason for non-determination:**

Awaiting determination

**S10/1533/FULL/PWM**

Date received:  
08-Jul-2010  
No of days: 193

**Mr Vito Cataffo, Ginos Restaurant**

Change of use from public house to restaurant with flat above with internal and external alterations  
23, Westgate, Grantham, NG316LU  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further info

**S10/1534/LB/PWM**

Date received:  
08-Jul-2010  
No of days: 193

**Mr Vito Cataffo, Ginos Restaurant**

Internal and external alterations to Listed Building  
23, Westgate, Grantham, NG316LU  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further info

**S10/1538/LB/PWM**

Date received:  
26-Jul-2010  
No of days: 175

**Ms Josefina Martinez-Perez**

Replacement windows, removal of door, re-pointing and removal of entrance hall  
Red House Farm, The Green, Allington, Grantham, NG322EA  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further info

**S10/1582/FULL/NB**

Date received:  
15-Jul-2010  
No of days: 186

**David Pennell, Burghley House Preservation Trust**

Conversion and extension of outbuildings to form dwelling  
43A, High Street, St Martins, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2LP  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting info from agent

**S10/1583/LB/NB**

Date received:  
15-Jul-2010  
No of days: 186

**David Pennell, Burghley House Preservation Trust**

Alteration and extension to listed building  
43A, High Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2LP  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting info from agent

**S10/1613/OUT/PL**

Date received:  
15-Jul-2010  
No of days: 186

**Rev C Martin, The Methodist Church**

Outline - residential development (4)  
High Street, Billingborough  
Reason for non-determination:  
Re-advertised – adjacent listed buildings

**S10/1668/FULL/NB**

Date received:  
17-Aug-2010  
No of days: 153

**Mr G Day**

Erection of dwelling and detached garage  
Church Farm, 3, Church Street, Corby Glen, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4NJ  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amended plans

**S10/1732/FULL/JJ**

Date received:  
30-Jul-2010  
No of days: 171

**Mike Sibthorp Planning**

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two 2 1/2 storey dwellings  
6, Fox Dale, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2UZ  
Reason for non-determination:  
Applicant appealing against non-determination

**S10/1735/FULL/PL**

Date received:  
07-Sep-2010  
No of days: 132

**Mrs J Sherlock, Grantham Investments**

Change of use from A1 to A3 (food & drink) and A4 (public house)  
12, Westgate, Grantham, NG31 6LT  
Reason for non-determination:  
Likely to be withdrawn

**S10/1759/FULL/PWM**

Date received:  
24-Sep-2010  
No of days: 115

**A & B White**

Erection of one wind turbine (hub height 50m, blade diameter 33.4m and total ground to tip height 66.7m) and associated access track and crane hardstanding  
Frinkley Farm, Frinkley Lane, Hougham, Grantham, NG32 2JQ  
Reason for non-determination:  
To future Committee (01/03/11)

**S10/1776/LB/TF**

Date received:  
15-Sep-2010  
No of days: 124

**Sir S Benton Jones**

Partial demolition of listed building and erection of two single storey side extensions and front canopy to pool house  
Irnham Hall, Corby Road, Irnham, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4JD  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further info

**S10/1800/ADV/PL**

Date received:  
05-Aug-2010  
No of days: 165

**Mrs G Noon, Great Gonerby Parish Council**

Erection of direction sign to cemetery  
Land At Belton Lane, Opposite Covill Close, Great Gonerby, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Sign to be relocated

**S10/1805/FULL/KJC**

Date received:  
13-Oct-2010  
No of days: 96

**Mr S Turner, Grantham Roofing Services Ltd**

Residential Development for the creation of nine flats including demolition of the existing building  
20b, Swinegate, Grantham, NG316RJ  
Reason for non-determination:  
On-going negotiations

**S10/1807/ADV/PWM**

Date received:  
20-Sep-2010  
No of days: 119

**Mr Vito Cataffo, Ginos Restaurant**

Display of advertisements  
23, Westgate, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6LU  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further info

**S10/1853/FULL/TF**

Date received:  
15-Sep-2010  
No of days: 124

**Sir Simon Benton Jones**

Partial demolition of listed building, extensions to pool house and change of use to events use  
Irnham Hall, Corby Road, Irnham, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4JD  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting further info

**S10/1965/LB/FF**

Date received:  
29-Sep-2010  
No of days: 110

**Miss Sophie Brown**

Internal and external alterations to dwelling  
The Nook, 15, Chapel Lane, Claypole, Newark, Lincolnshire,  
NG23 5BB

Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting determination

**S10/1972/HSH/FF**

Date received:  
31-Aug-2010  
No of days: 139

**Mr & Mrs D Mathieson**

Extension and alterations to dwelling  
Keepers Cottage, Sand Lane, Marston, Grantham, NG32 2HX

Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting determination

**S10/1978/FULL/JJ**

Date received:  
01-Oct-2010  
No of days: 108

**Mr S Fox, Alston Homes**

Conversion, alteration and extension of barns to create 5  
dwellings; erection of 2 dwellings and car port and shed,  
erection of 3m earth bund

Towngate House Farm, Towngate West, Market Deeping

Reason for non-determination:

Meeting to be arranged with agent to discuss project

**S10/2002/FULL/RV**

Date received:  
31-Aug-2010  
No of days: 139

**Mrs N Jacobs \*, Bourne Town Council**

Change of use from residential land to cemetery and 14 space  
car parking area

Land Rear Of, 41-45, South Road, Bourne

Reason for non-determination:

Awaiting details from Town Council and consultees

**S10/2015/LB/JJ**

Date received:  
01-Oct-2010  
No of days: 108

**Mr S Fox, Alston Homes**

Conversion, alteration and extension of listed building

Towngate House Farm, Towngate West, Market Deeping

Reason for non-determination:

Meeting to be arranged with agent to discuss project

**S10/2020/FULL/JJ**

Date received:  
03-Sep-2010  
No of days: 136

**Mr C Riddle**

Extension to existing dwelling, change of use and extension to  
existing barns to form dwelling and erection of 3 dwellings

47, East End, Langtoft, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9LP

Reason for non-determination:

Currently assessing enabling development calculations

**S10/2021/LB/JJ**

Date received:  
03-Sep-2010  
No of days: 136

**Mr C Riddle**

Extension and alterations of farmhouse, conversion and  
extension and rebuild of barn and dovecote

47, East End, Langtoft, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9LP

Reason for non-determination:

Currently assessing enabling development calculations

**S10/2134/HSH/FF**

Date received:  
20-Sep-2010  
No of days: 119

**Mr J Shimel**

Two storey rear extension to dwelling  
56, Eastgate, Deeping St James, Peterborough, PE6 8HJ  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting determination

**S10/2142/FULL/TF**

Date received:  
01-Oct-2010  
No of days: 108

**Invicta Developments Ltd**

Demolish existing walls & carports to form new vehicular access and erection of 12 garages  
Land Off Albert Street, Grantham  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting revisions

**S10/2181/FULL/FF**

Date received:  
01-Oct-2010  
No of days: 108

**George Bowman & Son Ltd**

Provision of hard standing for outside seating area  
The Fighting Cocks, 13, Market Place, Corby Glen, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4NH  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting determination

**S10/2185/FULL/TF**

Date received:  
23-Sep-2010  
No of days: 116

**Daltons Solicitors**

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 pairs of semi-detached dwellings  
St Nicholas, Priory Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2EU  
Reason for non-determination:  
May be withdrawn

**S10/2190/HSH/PL**

Date received:  
11-Oct-2010  
No of days: 98

**Mr B Collin**

Removal of outbuildings to rear and erection of rear extensions, replacement porch, replacement roof to dormer, demolition and rebuild store, erection of detached garage/carport and loose boxes  
Kirk Cottage, 229, Main Street, Welby, Grantham, NG32 3LT  
Reason for non-determination:  
Amended plans received

**S10/2200/LDE/TF**

Date received:  
23-Sep-2010  
No of days: 116

**Mr D T Copland**

Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) for existing builders yard use  
171, Eastgate, Deeping St James, Peterborough, PE6 8RB  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting revisions

**S10/2211/FULL/TF**

Date received:  
12-Oct-2010  
No of days: 97

**Ged Smith, GCS Building Services**

Erection of two dwellings  
Ryhall House, Ryhall Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 1UF  
Reason for non-determination:  
May be withdrawn

**S10/2224/FULL/PL**

Date received:  
01-Oct-2010  
No of days: 108

**Mr R Potts**

Erection of 1.5 storey office building (B1)  
46, Main Road, Long Bennington, Newark, NG23 5DJ  
Reason for non-determination:  
Related application to be submitted

**S10/2230/FULL/TF**

Date received:  
13-Oct-2010  
No of days: 96

**Mr R F Addy**

Erection of agricultural workers dwelling  
Five Acres, Hards Lane, Frognall, Peterborough, Lincolnshire,  
PE6 8RP  
Reason for non-determination:  
May be withdrawn

**S10/2306/FULL/RV**

Date received:  
20-Oct-2010  
No of days: 89

**Mr B Taylor**

Formation of vehicular access  
Bunkers Hill Farmhouse, 54, Bourne Road, Morton, Bourne,  
PE10 0RN  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting comments of consultees on new info

**S10/2312/FULL/NB**

Date received:  
12-Oct-2010  
No of days: 97

**Mark Harrod, Agellus Hotels Limited**

Change of use from residential (C3) to restaurant (A3) and  
hotel (C1) and erection of single storey and part two storey  
rear extension  
4, St Marys Place, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2DN  
Reason for non-determination:  
To a future Committee

**S10/2313/LB/NB**

Date received:  
12-Oct-2010  
No of days: 97

**Mark Harrod, Agellus Hotels Limited**

Alterations and extensions to listed building  
4, St Marys Place, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2DN  
Reason for non-determination:  
To a future Committee

**S10/2345/LB/IVW**

Date received:  
05-Nov-2010  
No of days: 73

**Mr Michael Watson**

Alteration of listed building  
Lordship House, Main Street, Welby, Grantham, Lincolnshire,  
NG32 3LP  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amended drawings

**S10/2379/LB/IVW**

Date received:  
02-Nov-2010  
No of days: 76

**Mr & Mrs N Merricks**

Alteration of listed building  
110, Station Street, Rippingale, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10  
0TA  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amended drawings

**S10/2400/FULL/JJ**

Date received:  
26-Oct-2010  
No of days: 83

**N P Investments**

New pedestrian entrance to public house (resubmission)  
London Inn, 4, St. Johns Street, Stamford, PE9 2DB  
Reason for non-determination:  
Agent notified of objections from Stamford Civic Society

**S10/2547/FULL/PWM**

Date received:  
15-Nov-2010  
No of days: 63

**Mr A Grylls, on behalf of AG, JE & SC Grylls**

Demolition of existing garage and erection of one and a half storey dwelling  
3, High Road, Barrowby, Grantham, NG321BH  
Reason for non-determination:  
To a future Committee (01/03/11)

**S10/2555/FULL/PJM**

Date received:  
12-Nov-2010  
No of days: 66

**Delwood Properties**

Change of Use of residential care home and staff accommodation to house of multiple occupation  
98, Bridge End Road, Grantham, NG317ES  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting amended S106 agreement

**S10/2593/FULL/PL**

Date received:  
19-Nov-2010  
No of days: 59

**Mr M Bailey**

Erection of dwelling  
R/o 62 & 64 Manthorpe Road, Grantham, NG31 8DN  
Reason for non-determination:  
Consultation period not expired

**S10/2619/FULL/NB**

Date received:  
19-Nov-2010  
No of days: 59

**Mr Graham Hedley, Stamford Bridge Club**

Erection of bridge club house  
Land Adj Stamford & District Indoor Bowls Club, Off, Exeter Gardens, Stamford  
Reason for non-determination:  
To a future Committee

**S10/2716/FULL/RV**

Date received:  
16-Nov-2010  
No of days: 62

**Mr C Crabbe**

Conversion of first floor to stables and garage to self contained annex and provision of 3 rooflights  
Baston House, 59, Main Street, Baston, Peterborough, PE6 9PB  
Reason for non-determination:  
Awaiting details from applicant for Conservation Officer

**APPLICATIONS DECIDED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS  
FROM 13 DECEMBER 2010 – 14 JANUARY 2011**

**S10/1103/HSH**

Applicant: Mr Ralph Jupp  
Proposal: Demolition of existing garage & erection of two storey extension  
Location: 22, Chapel Hill, Ropsley, Grantham, NG334BP  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 13 January 2011

**S10/1281/OUT**

Applicant: Mr J West, Taylor Wimpey East Midlands  
Proposal: Variation of Condition 7 (layout and design and access statement) of Outline Planning Permission S07/0555  
Location: Springfield Park, Springfield Road, Grantham  
Decision: Withdrawn - 17 December 2010

**S10/1411/OUT**

Applicant: Mr Jordan West, Taylor Wimpey East Midlands  
Proposal: Variation of Condition 6 - Overall ridge height of the development of planning permission S07/0555  
Location: Springfield Park, Springfield Road, Grantham  
Decision: Withdrawn - 17 December 2010

**S10/1422/LB**

Applicant: Mr A Croson  
Proposal: Demolish existing courtyard extension, erection of new single storey extension, installation of solar panels to rear roof slope and re-paint shopfront  
Location: 9A, St Peters Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2PQ  
Decision: Refused - 20 December 2010

**S10/1673/LB**

Applicant: Mr A Schiorlin  
Proposal: Internal alterations (replacement stairs and removal of chimney)  
Location: 63, St Leonards Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2HU  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 30 December 2010

**S10/1731/FULL**

Applicant: Persimmon Homes (EM) Limited  
Proposal: Construction of access road for residential development  
Location: Former Mays Garage, Spalding Road, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9LE  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 13 December 2010

**S10/1756/AG**

Applicant: Mr David Walker  
Proposal: Prior Determination - Erection of agricultural building to house livestock  
Location: Gate Lodge Farm, Bennington Lane, Westborough, Newark, NG23 5HG  
Decision: Not required - 16 December 2010

**S10/1788/FULL**

Applicant: Mr F Newton  
Proposal: Change of use of grassed area to domestic garden (retrospective)  
Location: 22, Brookside, Ancaster, Grantham, NG32 3QT  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 06 January 2011

**S10/1963/FULL**

Applicant: Belvoir Estate  
Proposal: Change of use of land to car parking area associated with adjacent semi-permanent marquee  
Location: Land Adjacent To Belvoir Castle  
Decision: Withdrawn - 04 January 2011

**S10/1964/FULL**

Applicant: Oak Valley Homes Ltd  
Proposal: Erection of dwelling (amendment to S09/2759)  
Location: Plot 1 R/o 46 High Street, Caythorpe, Grantham, NG23 3DN  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 06 January 2011

**S10/1998/FULL**

Applicant: Robin Immink, Gregoire Besson UK Limited  
Proposal: Clad and change of use of agricultural building to industrial (B1, B2 and B8); alteration of access and erection of 2.2m tall pallisade fence  
Location: Land Opposite 41 Spalding Road, Bourne  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 December 2010

**S10/2045/FULL**

Applicant: Mr P Burrows, Lindpet Properties Ltd  
Proposal: Conversion of former stables to day nursery including formation of external play area and car park  
Location: Granby Mews, Conduit Lane, Grantham  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 13 January 2011

**S10/2063/FULL**

Applicant: Malabar Estates Ltd  
Proposal: Conversion of upper floors to create 2 residential flats  
Location: 8, High Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2AL  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 11 January 2011

**S10/2064/LB**

Applicant: Malabar Estates Ltd  
Proposal: Internal alterations to listed building to form two residential flats  
Location: 8, High Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2AL  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 11 January 2011

**S10/2097/FULL**

Applicant: Mr Patrick Buckley  
Proposal: Alteration and extension of existing barn to form annexe accommodation  
Location: Old Manor House, Main Street, Little Humby, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4HW  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 January 2011

**S10/2099/LB**

Applicant: Mr Patrick Buckley  
Proposal: Alteration and extension of existing barn  
Location: Old Manor House, Main Street, Little Humby, Grantham,  
Lincolnshire, NG33 4HW  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 January 2011

**S10/2102/HSB**

Applicant: Mr Robert Baines  
Proposal: Erection of metal access gate between 2 Church Street and  
7a Market Place  
Location: 2, Church Street, Corby Glen, Grantham, NG33 4NJ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 December 2010

**S10/2108/DC**

Applicant: Simon J R Brown, Ash Mill Developments Limited  
Proposal: Approval of details of conditions 2 (remediation), 9  
(materials), 10 (levels) and 17 (archaeology) of planning  
permission S10/0636  
Location: Belton Street/Gas Street, Stamford, Lincs  
Decision: Approved - 13 December 2010

**S10/2109/HSB**

Applicant: Mr Robert Sutton  
Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey  
rear/side extension (annexe) and rear conservatory and  
erection of detached double garage/games room  
Location: Alberta Cottage, 62, Belton Lane, Grantham, NG31 9HS  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 13 January 2011

**S10/2114/FULL**

Applicant: Mr J Willis  
Proposal: Erection of two dwellings and associated garages  
Location: Parklands, Vicarage Lane, Long Bennington, Newark,  
NG23 5DN  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 December 2010

**S10/2119/FULL**

Applicant: Mr R Reedman & Mrs C Rudd  
Proposal: Application under Section 73 of the Town and County  
Planning Act 1990 to remove Condition 6 (protected area  
for trees during construction), 8 (obscure glazing), 12  
(protected species survey) of planning permission S10/1060  
Location: 48-50, East End, Langtoft  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 December 2010

**S10/2126/FULL**

Applicant: Mr Colin Smith  
Proposal: Provision of new access and boundary hedge  
Location: The Paddock, Swinstead Road, Corby Glen, Grantham,  
NG33 4NU  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 04 January 2011

**S10/2139/FULL**

Applicant: Waitrose Limited  
Proposal: Installation of refrigerated containers and erection of 2.4m boarded fence  
Location: Waitrose Ltd, West Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2PR  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 December 2010

**S10/2161/FULL**

Applicant: Mr Brian Hoyes  
Proposal: Change of use from shop to (C3) residential  
Location: 4, St Georges Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2BJ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 December 2010

**S10/2163/FULL**

Applicant: Mr Brian Hoyes  
Proposal: Change of use from shop use to residential house (C3)  
Location: 5, St Georges Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2BJ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 December 2010

**S10/2225/OUT**

Applicant: Mr A Moody  
Proposal: Variation of condition 1 of outline planning permission S07/1428 for the erection of 3 dwellings with access from Churchill Avenue to extend time limit to implement permission  
Location: 37, West Road, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9PS  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 06 January 2011

**S10/2264/HSH**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Ian Garratt  
Proposal: Erection of oak framed garage and store  
Location: The Old Dairy, Scotland Lane, Ingoldsby, Grantham, NG33 4ES  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 December 2010

**S10/2270/FULL**

Applicant: Mr C Gibson  
Proposal: Erection of agricultural building (retrospective)  
Location: Dock Furrows Farm, North Road, Bourne, PE100AD  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 December 2010

**S10/2286/ADV**

Applicant: Tesco Stores Ltd  
Proposal: Advertisement hoarding for supermarket  
Location: Tesco, land at South Road, Bourne  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 December 2010

**S10/2294/LB**

Applicant: A McGregor  
Proposal: Alteration of listed building  
Location: Austin House, 4, Austin Street, Stamford, PE9 2QR  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 December 2010

**S10/2308/RM**

Applicant: Mr B Clare  
Proposal: Erection of dwelling (reserved matters for S07/1307)  
Location: 38, Church Street, Market Deeping, Peterborough, PE68DA  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 22 December 2010

**S10/2310/LB**

Applicant: Kennedy Leigh Charitable Trust  
Proposal: Demolish and rebuild wall (1.2m high) to front of listed building  
Location: 43, Corby Road, Swayfield, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4LQ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 December 2010

**S10/2316/FULL**

Applicant: Vernon Holdings Ltd c/o Brown & Co  
Proposal: Four bay extension to industrial unit  
Location: Unit 6, Orchard Park, Isaac Newton Way, Grantham, NG31 9SX  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 December 2010

**S10/2330/LB**

Applicant: Mr Anthony Towers  
Proposal: Alterations to listed building  
Location: 46, High Street, Billingborough, Sleaford, NG340QB  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 December 2010

**S10/2333/HSB**

Applicant: Mr Steven Railton  
Proposal: Two storey extension including demolition of porch  
Location: 13, Hunt Lea Avenue, Grantham, NG31 7JJ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 13 January 2011

**S10/2334/FULL**

Applicant: G R Ward & Co  
Proposal: Erection of wind turbine (18m hub height)  
Location: Elms Farm House, Frieston Heath, Frieston, Grantham, NG32 3HD  
Decision: Refused - 24 December 2010

**S10/2343/FULL**

Applicant: Mr C Kilham  
Proposal: Erection of stable block for domestic use  
Location: Pt OS 6400, Tanners Lane, Corby Glen  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 December 2010

**S10/2344/HSB**

Applicant: Dr & Mrs M Higgins  
Proposal: Rear single storey extension (garden room)  
Location: Innisfree, Church Street, Barrowby, Grantham, NG32 1BX  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 December 2010

**S10/2351/LB**

Applicant: Mr M Bust  
Proposal: Alteration of listed building (erection of garage)  
Location: Crestwood House, 52, High Street, St. Martins, Stamford, PE9 2LG  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 04 January 2011

**S10/2354/LDP**

Applicant: Mrs L J Adams  
Proposal: Single storey extension to rear of existing dwelling  
Location: 23, Charlock Drive, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2WP  
Decision: Lawful Development - 15 December 2010

**S10/2357/HS**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Caswell  
Proposal: Erection of conservatory  
Location: 6, Saxon Way, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9QX  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 December 2010

**S10/2361/HS**

Applicant: Philip Hirst  
Proposal: Formation of additional dormer window in western elevation, internal alterations  
Location: 57, Main Road, Uffington, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4SN  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 December 2010

**S10/2362/LB**

Applicant: Philip Hirst  
Proposal: Formation of an additional dormer window in western elevation, internal alterations  
Location: 57, Main Road, Uffington, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4SN  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 December 2010

**S10/2402/LB**

Applicant: Mr David Hobbs  
Proposal: Internal and external alterations to listed building including replacement of internal staircase and formation of flat roof over existing central valley  
Location: The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Burton Coggles, Grantham, NG33 4JZ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 07 January 2011

**S10/2404/HS**

Applicant: Kennedy Leigh Charitable Trust  
Proposal: Demolish existing wall and erection of new wall  
Location: 43, Corby Road, Swayfield, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4LQ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 06 January 2011

**S10/2411/HS**

Applicant: Mr S Bailey  
Proposal: Single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension  
Location: Alwyn, 110, Empingham Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2SU  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 11 January 2011

**S10/2414/LB**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs M Cowgill  
Proposal: Replacement of windows on south and west elevation and replacement front door  
Location: The Laurels, Main Street, Welby, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 3LP  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 31 December 2010

**S10/2417/LB**

Applicant: Mr G Robinson  
Proposal: Alteration of curtilage listed building  
Location: Green View, Church Street, Skillington, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5HQ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 30 December 2010

**S10/2422/HSH**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Mitcham  
Proposal: Replacement garage to dwelling  
Location: 30, Sutherland Way, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2TB  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 22 December 2010

**S10/2428/HSH**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs L J Piggott  
Proposal: Extension to kitchen to the front of the existing dwelling  
Location: 40, Chapel Lane, Thurlby, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0EW  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 15 December 2010

**S10/2430/ADV**

Applicant: McDonalds Restaurant Ltd  
Proposal: Freestanding 6.5m totem sign  
Location: McDonalds Restaurants Ltd, Bridge End Road, Grantham, NG31 7ES  
Decision: Refused - 06 January 2011

**S10/2431/FULL**

Applicant: The Springwells Practice  
Proposal: Erection of waste bin enclosure  
Location: The New Springwells Practice, Spring Wells, Billingborough, Sleaford, NG34 0QQ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 December 2010

**S10/2433/LB**

Applicant: Mr C Crabbe  
Proposal: Replacement rooflight, re-rendering of front elevation and 2 chimney stacks (retrospective) and removal of chimney to outbuilding  
Location: Baston House, 59, Main Street, Baston, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9PB  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 20 December 2010

**S10/2448/HSH**

Applicant: Mr N Woods  
Proposal: Erection of extension to rear of dwelling  
Location: 7, Darley Dale Crescent, Grantham, NG31 8EH  
Decision: Refused - 11 January 2011

**S10/2449/HSH**

Applicant: Dr H Deo  
Proposal: Two storey extension to garage to create domestic workshop with domestic gym above  
Location: 12, Overgate Road, Swayfield, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4LG  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 10 January 2011

**S10/2451/FULL**

Applicant: Mr Richard Coney, Coney Farms  
Proposal: Installation of lighting to outdoor arena  
Location: Honington Grange, Frinkley Lane, Honington, Grantham, NG32 2PS  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 December 2010

**S10/2458/RM**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Anthony Bates  
Proposal: Erection of dwelling  
Location: Adjacent 16 Acklands Lane, Long Bennington, Newark,  
NG23 5EW  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 06 January 2011

**S10/2460/HSB**

Applicant: Mrs Maile  
Proposal: Erection of conservatory to rear of dwelling  
Location: 1, East Green, Witham On The Hill, Bourne, Lincolnshire,  
PE10 0JF  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 13 December 2010

**S10/2474/HSB**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs P Bailes  
Proposal: Rear extension to bungalow  
Location: 21, Rosemary Crescent, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 7JS  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 12 January 2011

**S10/2475/HSB**

Applicant: Mr B Richardson  
Proposal: Extension to dwelling (Amendment to S08/1127)  
Location: Autumn Cottage, Main Street, Marston, Grantham,  
Lincolnshire, NG32 2HH  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 13 December 2010

**S10/2481/LDP**

Applicant: Ms Dring  
Proposal: Extension to side of dwelling (Lawful Development  
Certificate - Proposed)  
Location: 21, The Meadows, Long Bennington, Newark, Lincolnshire,  
NG23 5EL  
Decision: Lawful Development - 21 December 2010

**S10/2484/HSB**

Applicant: Mr P Jones  
Proposal: Erection of detached garage and store  
Location: 29, Edenham Road, Hanthorpe, Bourne, PE10 0RB  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 December 2010

**S10/2485/HSB**

Applicant: Mr Steve Squires  
Proposal: Extensions to dwelling  
Location: 85, Bridge End Road, Grantham, NG317EP  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 December 2010

**S10/2495/FULL**

Applicant: Miss Charlotte Wesson  
Proposal: Change of use of garage (C3) to hair salon (A1)  
Location: 3, Main Road, Stainby, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5QS  
Decision: Refused - 13 January 2011

**S10/2501/HSB**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs P Blackler  
Proposal: Erection of garage and potting shed  
Location: Shepherds Cottage, 28, Halfleet, Market Deeping,  
Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 8DB  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 December 2010

**S10/2507/HSH**

Applicant: Mr Colin Crabbe  
Proposal: Erection of porch and increase height of garden wall  
Location: Baston House, 59, Main Street, Baston, Peterborough,  
Lincolnshire, PE6 9PB  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 December 2010

**S10/2508/LB**

Applicant: Mr Colin Crabbe  
Proposal: Replacement porch and kitchen window, increase height of  
boundary wall  
Location: Baston House, 59, Main Street, Baston, Peterborough,  
Lincolnshire, PE6 9PB  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 December 2010

**S10/2515/FULL**

Applicant: Mr William Mair  
Proposal: Erection of grain store  
Location: Grange Farm, Braceborough, Stamford, PE9 4NU  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 13 December 2010

**S10/2521/HSH**

Applicant: Mr David Coulam  
Proposal: Erection of detached garage  
Location: Lime Tree House, Uffington Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire,  
PE9 2EX  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 December 2010

**S10/2524/DC**

Applicant: Mr John Walkley  
Proposal: Approval of details in relation to Condition 2 (render colour)  
of S10/1249  
Location: 96, Harrowby Road, Grantham, NG31 9DS  
Decision: Approved - 16 December 2010

**S10/2535/HSH**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Flint  
Proposal: Erection of conservatory  
Location: 1, Park Road, Allington, Grantham, NG322EB  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 17 December 2010

**S10/2538/HSH**

Applicant: Mrs B Child  
Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension  
Location: 8, Manor Drive, Baston, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6  
9PQ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 13 December 2010

**S10/2542/HSH**

Applicant: Mr K A Spurr  
Proposal: First floor extension to front of existing dwelling  
Location: 64, Hambleton Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2RZ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 15 December 2010

**S10/2543/HSH**

Applicant: Mr Brian Cooke  
Proposal: Erection of double garage  
Location: Eau Well Farm, 94, Main Road, Dyke, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0AG  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 December 2010

**S10/2546/FULL**

Applicant: Mr E Raymen  
Proposal: Creation of additional dwelling  
Location: 96, Millfield Road, Deeping St James, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 8QY  
Decision: Refused - 20 December 2010

**S10/2548/HSH**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs R & O Ebsworth  
Proposal: Extension to bungalow including raising of roof  
Location: St James Bungalow, Side Street, Allington, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 2DZ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 22 December 2010

**S10/2550/HSH**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs M McNamee  
Proposal: Erection of single storey extension and chimney (revised scheme) with addition of rear dormer to two rooflights in front elevation  
Location: 67a, Main Road, Dyke, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0AF  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 December 2010

**S10/2551/HSH**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs N Rogers  
Proposal: Two storey rear extension and erection of shed  
Location: The Old School House, Main Street, Witham On The Hill, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0JH  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 20 December 2010

**S10/2552/LB**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs N Rogers  
Proposal: Demolition of single storey extension; alteration to single storey aspect and erection of two storey rear extension  
Location: The Old School House, Main Street, Witham On The Hill, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0JH  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 20 December 2010

**S10/2556/FULL**

Applicant: Croft Commercial Development Limited  
Proposal: Change of use of building (part of) from A3 (restaurant) to A1 (shop)  
Location: R/o, 8, St Marys Hill, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 04 January 2011

**S10/2557/LB**

Applicant: Croft Commercial Development Limited  
Proposal: Internal alterations to listed building  
Location: R/o, 8, St Marys Hill, Stamford  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 04 January 2011

**S10/2562/TCA**

Applicant: Mrs J Perez-Adamson  
Proposal: Removal of cedar tree in Conservation Area  
Location: Harlaxton Lodge, 7, Rectory Lane, Harlaxton, Grantham, NG32 1HD  
Decision: TC&P - Work allowed - 13 December 2010

**S10/2563/HSH**

Applicant: Mr Martin Winter  
Proposal: Erection of first floor extension, garden room and rendering and colourwashing first storey on front elevation  
Location: 18, York Way, Grantham, NG318RF  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 17 December 2010

**S10/2566/FULL**

Applicant: Mr I Thompson & Mr D Clarke  
Proposal: Erection of two dwellings (renewal of extant permission S07/0530)  
Location: R/o The Willows And Fenton, Back Lane, Long Bennington  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 13 January 2011

**S10/2572/HSH**

Applicant: Mr Kenneth Prince  
Proposal: Replacement of existing flat roof with pitch roof  
Location: 54, Cliffe Road, Gonerby Hill Foot, Grantham, NG318HS  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 December 2010

**S10/2573/HSH**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Malkin  
Proposal: Erection of conservatory  
Location: 25, Wingate Way, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9YL  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 15 December 2010

**S10/2579/FULL**

Applicant: Vicar & Church Wardens, Harlaxton PCC  
Proposal: Change of use of domestic garden to burial ground  
Location: R/o The Rectory, 6 Rectory Lane, Harlaxton, Grantham, NG321HD  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 06 January 2011

**S10/2581/HSH**

Applicant: Mr R Bates  
Proposal: Erection of double garage  
Location: 22, Bedehouse Bank, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9JX  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 December 2010

**S10/2582/TPO**

Applicant: Mr A Ambrose  
Proposal: Reduce the bough/co-dominant stem by 30% and reduce the remaining two overhanging branches extending from the remaining two co-dominant stems by 40% of horse chestnut tree protected by TPO - all extending over the garden of 17 Maplewood Close  
Location: 21, Hazelwood Drive, Gonerby Hill Foot, Grantham, NG318GZ  
Decision: Split decision - 13 December 2010

**S10/2583/TPO**

Applicant: Mr Stephen Clark  
Proposal: Reduce crowns by a maximum of 15% to balance appearance of crowns where necessary, remove limb overhanging building from lime tree (no 0428) and removal of two limes (nos 0421 & 0430) protected by TPO  
Location: King's House, 3, Gonerby Court, Grantham, NG31 8HT  
Decision: Split decision - 13 December 2010

**S10/2584/FULL**

Applicant: Stephen Bertuzzi  
Proposal: Change of use from residential (C3) to office (B1)  
Location: First floor flat, 60, High Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2LA  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 30 December 2010

**S10/2588/DC**

Applicant: Mr Paul Harkin, GSS Architecture  
Proposal: Approval of details of condition 2 (materials) required by S10/0682  
Location: Land R/o Existing Sports Hall, Conduit Road, Stamford  
Decision: Approved - 17 December 2010

**S10/2594/HSH**

Applicant: Mr K Ford  
Proposal: Two storey extension to rear, conservatory, porch and new access drive  
Location: 27, Easthorpe Road, Great Gonerby, Grantham, NG318LZ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 20 December 2010

**S10/2595/FULL**

Applicant: Mr D King  
Proposal: Erection of replacement dwelling  
Location: 39, Spalding Road, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0AU  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 December 2010

**S10/2596/HSH**

Applicant: Ms Lorraine Cullen  
Proposal: Replacement of existing shed with timber garage/storage shed  
Location: Oriel House, Colsterworth Road, Skillington, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5HF  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 07 January 2011

**S10/2599/HSH**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs T Stocker  
Proposal: Side extension and dormer to rear of dwelling  
Location: 1, Manor Way, Langtoft, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9ND  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 12 January 2011

**S10/2601/HSH**

Applicant: Mr Jack Dionysiou  
Proposal: Erection of extension to bungalow  
Location: 6, Parklands Drive, Harlaxton, Grantham, NG321HX  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 04 January 2011

**S10/2609/HSH**

Applicant: Mr D Christmas  
Proposal: Erection of two storey side and rear extension to dwelling  
Location: 30, Broadway Close, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9BN  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 16 December 2010

**S10/2625/DC**

Applicant: Mr Robert Watkins  
Proposal: Approval of details reserved by Condition 8 (levels) of S09/2754  
Location: 129, Belton Lane, Grantham, NG319HW  
Decision: Approved - 22 December 2010

**S10/2627/LB**

Applicant: Mr Robert Baines  
Proposal: Erection of metal access gate between 2 Church Street and 7a Market Place  
Location: 2, Church Street, Corby Glen, Grantham, NG33 4NJ  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 24 December 2010

**S10/2628/FULL**

Applicant: Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service  
Proposal: Installation of solar photovoltaics to roof  
Location: Fire Station, South Street, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9LY  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 11 January 2011

**S10/2630/TCA**

Applicant: Mr Ken Whitton  
Proposal: Lift crown and tidy two sycamore trees  
Location: The Old Manor House, 1 Rectory Lane, Harlaxton, Grantham, NG321HD  
Decision: TC&P - Work allowed - 12 January 2011

**S10/2631/TCA**

Applicant: Mr Bernard Norton  
Proposal: Reduction of height of trees/bushes to 6ft, remove some trees and replant with hornbeam  
Location: Coach House, Main Street, Belton, Grantham, NG32 2LW  
Decision: TC&P - Work allowed - 13 January 2011

**S10/2632/HSH**

Applicant: Mr E Skorupa  
Proposal: Single storey rear extension  
Location: 5, Cornwall Close, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 9PU  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 06 January 2011

**S10/2633/HSH**

Applicant: Mr Kit Smith  
Proposal: First floor side extension  
Location: 25, Signal Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 9BP  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 21 December 2010

**S10/2634/HSH**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Taylor  
Proposal: First floor and ground floor extensions to dwelling  
Location: 25, Chichester Close, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 8AS  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 10 January 2011

**S10/2636/ADV**

Applicant: Wolseley UK  
Proposal: Erection of signage  
Location: Plumb Centre, UNIT 2, Stamford Business Park, Ryhall Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 1XT  
Decision: Approved - 17 December 2010

**S10/2640/HSH**

Applicant: John B Williams  
Proposal: Installation of 3 rooflights  
Location: Highfield Barn, 35, Overgate Road, Swayfield, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4LG  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 January 2011

**S10/2648/HSH**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs D Matthews  
Proposal: Rear extension to dwelling and extension to garage  
Location: 325, Harlaxton Road, Grantham, NG317JP  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 04 January 2011

**S10/2652/FULL**

Applicant: Mr Adrian Morgan, The Christmas Cabin  
Proposal: Erection of storage building  
Location: Plantation Lodge Farm, Morkery Lane, Castle Bytham, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4SP  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 06 January 2011

**S10/2654/HSH**

Applicant: Mr C Simmonds  
Proposal: Erection of conservatory  
Location: 53, Woolsthorpe Road, Woolsthorpe By Colsterworth, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5NU  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 12 January 2011

**S10/2655/LB**

Applicant: Mr C Simmonds  
Proposal: Single storey extension to Listed Building  
Location: 53, Woolsthorpe Road, Woolsthorpe By Colsterworth, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5NU  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 12 January 2011

**S10/2680/FULL**

Applicant: Waterside Garden Centre  
Proposal: Single storey extension to retail area  
Location: Waterside Garden Centre, King Street, Baston, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9NY  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 January 2011

**S10/2683/DC**

Applicant: Mrs C Rudd & Mr R Reedman  
Proposal: Approval of details for Condition 3 (materials), 4 (hard and soft landscaping), 7 (drainage) and 13 (obscured kitchen doors) of S10/1060  
Location: Land Between, 48 & 50, East End, Langtoft  
Decision: Approved - 21 December 2010

**S10/2696/FULL**

Applicant: Mr J Dickinson  
Proposal: Variation of condition 1 of permission S07/1463 (conversion of farm buildings to dwelling)  
Location: Park Farm, West Road, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0LB  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 13 January 2011

**S10/2702/HSH**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs M Redding  
Proposal: Erection of first floor balcony  
Location: 21, High Street, Rippingale, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0SR  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 10 January 2011

**S10/2714/FULL**

Applicant: Baxter & King  
Proposal: Removal of Condition 4 (construction of private road) of S10/1564  
Location: 30-32, Spalding Road, Deeping St. James  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 10 January 2011

**S10/2717/FULL**

Applicant: The Salvation Army  
Proposal: Erection of single storey ancillary building to church  
Location: The Salvation Army, Manning Road, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9ET  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 11 January 2011

**S10/2726/HSH**

Applicant: Mr M Thomas  
Proposal: Erection of garden room with addition of chimney and stone cladding (revised scheme)  
Location: Meadow View, Wothorpe Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2JR  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 January 2011

**S10/2738/TCA**

Applicant: Dr Christopher Everett  
Proposal: Fell to the ground two sumachs, laburnum, lilac, holly and leylandii conifer hedge in Conservation Area  
Location: The Yews, Church Street, Barkston, Grantham, NG32 2NB  
Decision: TC&P - Work allowed - 13 January 2011

**S10/2753/TCA**

Applicant: Mrs Janet Brown, Lambs China & Glass Shop  
Proposal: Crown clean and reduce spread by approximately 20%, reduce overall height by up to 30% and reshape 3 sycamore trees  
Location: 36, St Marys Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2DS  
Decision: TC&P - Work allowed - 17 December 2010

**S10/2756/DC**

Applicant: Mr L Cragg, Barrowby Parish Council  
Proposal: Approval of matters reserved by condition 9 (external lighting) of p/p S09/0805  
Location: Barrowby Sports Pavilion, Low Road, Barrowby  
Decision: Approved - 12 January 2011

**S10/2771/TCA**

Applicant: Mrs J Perez-Adamson  
Proposal: Fell copse of pine trees and 3 cupressus trees in Conservation Area  
Location: Harlaxton Lodge, 7, Rectory Lane, Harlaxton, Grantham, NG32 1HD  
Decision: Split decision - 13 January 2011

**S10/2776/DC**

Applicant: Mr Alan James  
Proposal: Submission of details in relation to Condition 3 (Materials) of S10/0502  
Location: The Old Barn & Lofts Cottage, Cleveland Farm, Main Street, Claypole, NG23 5BA  
Decision: Approved - 15 December 2010

**S10/2847/CM**

Applicant: Spatial Planning, Lincolnshire County Council  
Proposal: Consultation on Scoping Opinion for Extension to Quarry (EIA) (your ref NAM/EIA 38/10)  
Location: Copper Hill Quarry, High Dyke, Ancaster  
Decision: No objections made (cons) - 29 December 2010

**S10/2852/NMA**

Applicant: Lincolnshire Herbs  
Proposal: Extension of marshalling area from 7m x 10m and small units through to main glasshouses (non-material amendment to Planning Approval S09/2398)  
Location: Lincolnshire Herbs Ltd, Spalding Road, Bourne, PE10 0AT  
Decision: Approved - 04 January 2011

**S10/2859/DC**

Applicant: Mr Jim Coupland  
Proposal: Approval of details reserved by condition 1 (drainage) of S10/1826  
Location: 26, Hurst Crescent, Barrowby, Grantham, NG321TE  
Decision: Approved - 12 January 2011

**S10/2860/NMAH**

Applicant: Mr Peter Knight  
Proposal: Non-material amendment (change to windows) to S10/0247  
Location: Willow Tree Farm, Fen Lane, Long Bennington, Newark, NG235ED  
Decision: Approved - 24 December 2010

**S10/2866/NMA**

Applicant: Mr E D Shakespeare  
Proposal: Non material amendment to S08/1321 (fenestration and door to dwelling)  
Location: 26, Angel Court, Ancaster, Grantham, NG32 3PR  
Decision: Approved conditionally - 14 January 2011

**S10/2870/CM**

Applicant: Lincolnshire County Council  
Proposal: Waste transfer station, one storey weighbridge, office/welfare unit and access road (your ref PL/0210/10)  
Location: Occupation Road, Gonerby Moor, Grantham  
Decision: No objections made - 13 January 2011

**PLANNING APPEALS 2010/2011 (excluding Enforcements)****NO OF APPEALS DETERMINED (based on Decision Date)**

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
LODGED	55	56	39	57	54	28
DISMISSED	52½	37	35	38	32½	18½
ALLOWED	20½	11	14	18	12½	10½
WITHDRAWN	5	5	2	2	2	0
<b>OUTSTANDING</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>14</b>

**APPEALS OUTSTANDING AT 31 DECEMBER 2010**

<b>S09/1233/MJRF</b> KJC Richard Edwards, Larkfleet Homes Erection of 29 affordable dwellings and associated infrastructure Land Off Valley Lane, Long Bennington	<b>Public Inquiry</b>	<u>Start Date</u> 29-Oct-2010  <u>Date of H / I</u> <b>02-Mar-2011</b>	
<b>S09/2490/HSB</b> PL Mr Simon Lewis Erection of 1.8m fence and gates 118, Fifth Avenue, Grantham, NG319TJ	<b>Written Evidence</b>	<u>Start Date</u> 06-May-2010  <u>Date of H / I</u> N/A	
<b>S09/2675/FULL</b> JST Mr M Thurlby, The Crown Hotel Change of use from dwellinghouse (C3) to use as four hotel bedrooms 6, Barn Hill, Stamford, PE9 2AE	<b>Written Evidence</b>	<u>Start Date</u> 18-Jun-2010  <u>Date of H / I</u> N/A	
<b>S10/0034/FULL</b> NB Mrs C Lister Retention of mobile home Langtoft Livery Stables, Cross Road, Langtoft Fen, Peterborough, PE6 9NX	<b>Written Evidence</b>	<u>Start Date</u> 30-Nov-2010  <u>Date of H / I</u> N/A	
<b>S10/0523/FULL</b> PJM Mr G Morgan Erection of dwelling Quarry Lodge, Pottergate Road, Ancaster, Grantham, NG32 3QZ	<b>Written Evidence</b>	<u>Start Date</u> 17-Sep-2010  <u>Date of H / I</u> N/A	

<p><b><u>S10/0745/FULL</u></b> JST Mr B Maynard, Stamford Homes Ltd Erection of four dwellings and associated works (Plot substitution 46-49 of application S09/1659) Former Quarry Farm Brickworks, Little Casterton Road, Stamford</p>	<p><b>Written Evidence</b></p>	<p><u>Start Date</u> 06-Oct-2010</p> <p><b><u>Date of H / I</u></b> N/A</p>	
<p><b><u>S10/1081/MJRF</u></b> KJC Mr T Bower &amp; Others Change of use of land to use as a residential caravan site for Gypsies and Travellers as defined by Paragraph 15 of Circular 01/2006, with 13 mobile homes and 13 touring caravans, including the laying out of hardstanding and creation of new access Land North Of Fallows End, Stragglethorpe Lane, Fulbeck, Grantham</p>	<p><b>Public Inquiry</b></p>	<p><u>Start Date</u> 11-Oct-2010</p> <p><b><u>Date of H / I</u></b> 16-Feb-2011</p>	
<p><b><u>S10/1246/HS</u></b> NB Mr David Lowe Two storey rear extension The Clock Tower, New Cross Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 1QZ</p>	<p><b>Written Evidence</b></p>	<p><u>Start Date</u> 22-Dec-2010</p> <p><b><u>Date of H / I</u></b> N/A</p>	
<p><b><u>S10/1260/FULL</u></b> KJC Mr R Ranshaw Change of use of office building to dwelling Barkston Heath Mushrooms, Heath Lane, Barkston</p>	<p><b>Informal Hearing</b></p>	<p><u>Start Date</u> 27-Sep-2010</p> <p><b><u>Date of H / I</u></b> 01-Feb-2011</p>	
<p><b><u>S10/1369/HS</u></b> JST Mr L Giaracuni Erection of detached domestic garage Paddock View, Main Street, Manthorpe, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0JE</p>	<p><b>Written Evidence</b></p>	<p><u>Start Date</u> 07-Dec-2010</p> <p><b><u>Date of H / I</u></b> N/A</p>	
<p><b><u>S10/1443/HS</u></b> JJ Mr &amp; Mrs R Bullen Extension to existing annex to residential dwelling ANNEXE 1, Pond Farm, Edenham Road, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0LG</p>	<p><b>Written Evidence</b></p>	<p><u>Start Date</u> 03-Nov-2010</p> <p><b><u>Date of H / I</u></b> N/A</p>	
<p><b><u>S10/1732/FULL</u></b> JJ Mike Sibthorp Planning Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two 2 1/2 storey dwellings 6, Fox Dale, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2UZ</p>	<p><b>Written Evidence</b></p>	<p><u>Start Date</u> 03-Dec-2010</p> <p><b><u>Date of H / I</u></b> N/A</p>	

<p><b><u>S10/1962/HS</u></b> RV  Dr H Deo  Erection of timber framed garage with tiled roof  12, Overgate Road, Swayfield, Grantham,  Lincolnshire, NG33 4LG</p>	<p><b>Written Evidence</b></p>	<p><u>Start Date</u>  09-Dec-2010</p> <p><b><u>Date of H / I</u></b>  N/A</p>	
<p><b><u>S10/2051/HS</u></b> PWM  Mr &amp; Mrs I M Crowther  Two and three storey side extension to dwelling  Castle View, 220, Bridge End Road, Grantham</p>	<p><b>Written Evidence</b></p>	<p><u>Start Date</u>  29-Dec-2010</p> <p><b><u>Date of H / I</u></b>  N/A</p>	

**RECENT APPEAL DECISIONS TO THE END OF DECEMBER 2010**

**Application Ref: S10/0530/HSH JJ**

**Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/A/10/21356**

Appeal Type: **Written Evidence**

Appellant:	Mr P Huggins
Proposal:	Two storey rear extension
Site:	40, Sutherland Way, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2TD

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal allowed - 23 December 2010
-------------------------	-----------------------------------

**SUMMARY**

This application was approved subject to a condition imposed by the Development Control Committee requiring a bedroom window on the rear elevation to be obscure glazed. The condition was imposed as Members had concerns about overlooking / loss of privacy from the proposed development.

The Inspector concluded that the extension as built does not unduly affect the privacy of neighbouring occupants and that the condition was unnecessary. The Appeal was therefore allowed and the condition removed.

## PLANNING ENFORCEMENT REPORT

September – December 2010

### Introduction

1. This report summarises the level of enforcement activity undertaken within South Kesteven District Council for the period September to December 2010. The purpose of this report is to provide Members with a report on progress of the Planning Enforcement Service for the period highlighted.

### Update

2. The Scheme of Delegation has been amended and the Head of Development and Growth has authorised the issuing of Planning Contravention Notices and Requisition for Information Notices to the Planning Enforcement Officers. These are first stage notices for information and commence enforcement action by the District Council on a formal basis.

### Staffing Issues

3. The two Planning Enforcement Officers still continue to operate the area in conjunction with the north and south sub divide of the district. I can confirm since the last reporting period the Section 106 Monitoring post has been made permanent and the current post holder has accepted the terms of the post outline.

### Assessing the need for enforcement action or prosecution

4. It was highlighted in the previous report that a six monthly enforcement report would now be undertaken on a regular basis to keep Members updated on current enforcement issues/cases. As part of the enforcement processes it is opined that Members have some perception of the processes and criteria set out in the reasoning and outcomes of enforcement issues. In deciding whether enforcement action or prosecution is expedient the Council will take the following steps:-
  - 4.1. Establish the facts – to find out what is happening on a site or in a building, who the owner/occupier is and the relevant planning history of the site.
  - 4.2. In doing this we may do any or all of the following:-
    - 4.2.1. Visit the site. This will usually be unannounced and photographs may be taken. Officers have powers to enter land under Section 196A, 196B and 196C of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
    - 4.2.2. Interview the developer, owner and/or occupier. Obtain information about the alleged breach of planning control and to give information about the enforcement process and options available.
    - 4.2.3. Occasionally, in serious cases in which a criminal offence may have been committed, it is likely that an interview under caution will be carried out, as required by the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984.

- 4.2.4. Issue of a Requisition for Information/Planning Contravention Notice or other statutory request for information.
  - 4.2.5. Check the Council's files for planning permission, planning conditions or other correspondence which may be relevant to the alleged breach of planning control.
  - 4.2.6. Make other enquiries with other statutory bodies and enforcement agencies to co-ordinate action.
- 4.3. Analyse the information gathered – we will discuss our findings with Planning Officers, Historic Building Officer and other professionals as appropriate and establish the degree of harm the matter is creating.
- 4.4. Decide which of the following categories the breach of control falls into:-
- 4.4.1. Development or unauthorised works that require enforcement action or prosecution (in appropriate cases) to be commenced immediately.
  - 4.4.2. Development or work that requires permission or consent and there is a reasonable chance that permission or consent will be granted.
  - 4.4.3. Development or works judged to be of a type or degree that it would not be expedient to take enforcement action.
  - 4.4.4. Development that is permitted development and therefore does not require planning permission.
  - 4.4.5. Development that is exempt from enforcement action due to the passage of time and is considered lawful.
  - 4.4.6. Development that does not constitute a breach of planning control.

## **Enforcement Report**

- 5. Since the last report there has been a further 100 complaints registered as of 31 December 2010. The overall complaints received in 2010 in total are 262. Of those cases 135 have been closed based on a conclusion of e.g. no breach, planning application submitted, not expedient and time barred.
- 6. There have been no enforcement notices served since the last reporting period. There has been 1 enforcement appeal that has been determined. Currently no Breach of Condition Notice, Listed Building Enforcement Notice or Section 215 Notice has been served during this reporting period.

## Enforcement Performance Figures September/December 2010

Cases Opened	100
Cases Closed	80

<b>ACTIONS</b>	
Enforcement Notices	Nil
Beach of Condition Notices	Nil
S215 Notices	Nil
Listed Building Enforcement Notice	Nil
Temporary Stop Notice	Nil
Stop Notice	Nil
Prosecutions (Notice non-compliance)	Nil
Prosecutions (Adverts)	Nil
PCN/S330/S16 Notice	8

<b>APPEALS</b>	
Enforcement Appeal Lodged	Nil
Enforcement Appeal Dismissed	1
Enforcement Appeal Allowed	Nil
Enforcement Appeal Withdrawn	Nil

### Enforcement Action

1. **Greytrex House, Tinwell Road Lane, Stamford** – Planning Inspectorate awarded partial costs to council. Appellant is unwilling to accept council's break down of costs. Order of the court being pursued by legal.
2. **Grange Farm, Hougham** – Enforcement Notice served in connection with unauthorised use of land (car boot sales). Enforcement monitoring.
3. **Land adj Hards Lane, Frognall** – further buildings erected on land. Pursue enforcement action with further enforcement notice.
4. **Mama Liz's Soul Shack, 9A North Street, Stamford** – Public Inquiry 2 November 2010. Permitted use as restaurant with ancillary bar facilities. Currently establishment being used as a mixed use - restaurant and live music venue. Appeal dismissed and appellants have 30 days to comply with enforcement notice.
5. **Land adj Fallows End, Stragglethorpe Lane, Fulbeck Lowfields** – Public Inquiry regarding planning application refusal scheduled for 16 February 2011. Liaised with legal and appropriate documents for Injunctive proceedings have been presented to Counsel. Legal still collating further information regarding prosecution of the enforcement notice.
6. **Black Bull, Lobthorpe** – non compliance with enforcement notice regarding unauthorised alterations to listed building. Documents with legal for prosecution.
7. **Café Black, Stamford** – still undetermined planning application for the canopy. Acting Lead Professional pursuing matter. Will be presented before Development Control Committee 1 February 2011.

8. **New Fox Service Station, South Witham** – awaiting legal to serve enforcement notice regarding use of land for sale of motor homes.
9. **Tallington Lakes, Tallington** – a number of complex matters have been encountered at the caravan park. Legal seeking Counsel's advice on a number of issues at the site e.g. occupation/ownership of caravans, planning unit, Planning Contravention Notice responses and planning history.
10. **38 Chapel Street, Haconby** – awaiting legal to serve enforcement notice regarding extension of garden onto agricultural land.
11. **14 Berkley Drive, Bourne** – prosecution for non-return of Requisition for Information Notice prior to serving enforcement Notice regarding unauthorised fence.
12. **Land off Dykes Drove, Dyke** – unauthorised use of caravan and unit for residential purposes also erection of workshop building and storage of vehicles. Section 330, Requisition for Information notices served awaiting responses.

## **Section 106 Monitoring Officer**

Following the Draft internal Audit Report by RSM Tenon dated July 2010, which Members have already seen in the last Enforcement Report, the following recommendations were made by the Auditors:-

1. A formal periodic S106 Group meeting should be established between key officers involved in the process including Planning, Legal, Finance and the S106 Officer.

**Monthly meetings have been arranged for the third Thursday of every month. 3 meetings have taken place since the last Enforcement Report.**

2. Periodic management reports showing a breakdown of expected S106 income against actual income received.

**This will be available when the new S106 monitoring database in APAS is up and running. Mark Williets authorized purchase of the APAS module in November 2010. Awaiting IT to purchase software package.**

3. Obligations should not be highlighted as complete on the monitoring spreadsheet until evidence is received documenting that obligations/contributions have been completed by the Developer;

**Adopted as per Auditors recommendation.**

4. A policy should be approved covering the Council's current approach;

**A Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared by Andy Moger of Planning Policy which is currently under consultation. Responses due by 20 December 2010.**

5. Documented procedural guidance should be collated covering the day to day responsibilities of the Monitoring Officer, including maintenance of the agreement register and monitoring /chasing S106 agreement obligations.

**This has been prepared by the Monitoring Officer and given to Paul Green/Cliff Middleton (acting Lead Professionals) for approval.**

### S106 MONIES RECEIVED SINCE 14.09.10

<b>S106 Ref No</b>	<b>Planning App Ref</b>	<b>Site Location</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Received</b>
(98)	S08/1026	Land at Kempton Way, Off Dysart Road, Grantham (TR)	£10,000.00	29.10.10
(22)	S02/1169	Land off Springfield Road, Grantham (£75,000.00 - EDU - 50%) (£22,500.00 - PE - 50%)	£97,500.00	29.11.10
(41)	S04/1895	Land at Dysart Farm, Long Bennington (EDU)	£72,447.00	06.12.10

Key: PE = Play Equipment; GAM = Green Area Maintenance; AH = Affordable Housing; EDU = Education;  
AOS = Adoption of Open Space; PCT – Primary Care Trust; ART = Public Art; TR = Highways;  
TCE = Town Centre Enhancement

**TOTAL RECEIVED BY SKDC (Since last Report) £169,947.00**

**TOTAL RECEIVED BY SKDC (from 1 April 2010 to date) £626,365.50**

**MONIES PAID DIRECT LCC**

**TOTAL PAID DIRECT TO LCC (from 1 April 2010 to date) £105,800.00**

## **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Committee note the content of the report.