AGENDA

For a meeting of the

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

to be held on

TUESDAY, 6 MARCH 2012

at

1.00 PM

*** PLEASE NOTE TIME OF MEETING ***

(THE LATE REPORT WILL BE AVAILABLE IN THE MEMBERS' ROOM FROM 12 NOON)

in the

COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, ST PETERS HILL, GRANTHAM

Beverly Agass, Chief Executive

Committee Members:	Councillors Parkin (Chairman); Wilkins (Vice-Chairman); Ashberry; Cook; Higgs; Howard; Mrs Kaberry-Brown; Vic Kerr; King; Morgan; Powell; Jacky Smith; Mrs Judy Smith; Stevens; Adam Stokes; Mrs Brenda Sumner and Wren.
Committee Support Officer:	Malcolm Hall Tel: 01476 406118 m.hall@southkesteven.gov.uk

(PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE WILL BE A COMFORT BREAK AT 3.00PM 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. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked to declare an interest in matters for consideration at the meeting

3. MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 7TH FEBRUARY 2012

(Enclosure)

4. PLANNING MATTERS

To consider applications received for the grant of planning permission – reports prepared by the Case Officer.

(Enclosure)

5. SECTION 106 AGREEMENT - DEED OF VARIATION S11/3064 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, NEALES CRESCENT, DYSART ROAD, GRANTHAM - SUBSTITUTION OF HOUSE TYPES

Report PLA927 by the Development Manager Service Manager.

(Enclosure)

6. INFORMATION RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND OTHER PLANNING ACTIVITY

Report No. PLA925 by the Development Management Service Manager.

(Enclosure)

PUBLIC SPEAKING

Anyone who would like to speak at the meeting should notify the Committee administrator one working day before the time of the meeting. The deadline by which you must notify us for the 2011/12 meetings are:

Meeting Date	Notification Deadline
Tuesday 7 February 2012, 1pm	Monday 6 February 2012, 1pm
Tuesday 6 March 2012, 1pm	Monday 5 March 2012, 1pm
Tuesday 3 April 2012, 1pm	Monday 2 April 2012, 1pm

If you would like to include photographs or other information as part of your presentation to the Committee, please send the information in an electronic format (e-mail with attachments, memory stick or disc) to the relevant case officer at least one working day before the meeting. If you are submitting hard copy information, please send it to the relevant case officer at least two working days before the meeting.

All speakers are at the Committee Chairman's (or Vice-Chairman's) discretion. Each person is allowed to speak for 3 minutes. Members of the Council are allowed to speak for 5 minutes in accordance with Council Procedure Rules.

Only one speaker for the applicant or the town and parish council will be allowed to speak. If there are several supporters or objectors to an application, they are encouraged to appoint a representative to present a joint case.

Development Control Committee members are able to ask questions about speakers' presentations. There is a time limit of 10 minutes for each speaker.

ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS

1. Short introductory presentation by the case officer
2. Speakers (Committee members will ask questions after each speaker)
    a. District Councillors who are not Committee members
    b. Representative from town/parish council
    c. Objectors to an application
    d. Supporters of an application
    e. The applicant or agent for the applicant
3. Debate – Councillors will discuss the application and make proposals
4. Vote – the Committee will vote to agree its decision

MINUTES

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 7 FEBRUARY 2012

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Ashberry
Councillor Cook
Councillor Higgs
Councillor Howard
Councillor Mrs Kaberry-Brown
Councillor Vic Kerr
Councillor Morgan
Councillor Parkin (in the Chair)
Councillor Powell
Councillor Jacky Smith
Councillor Mrs Judy Smith
Councillor Judy Stevens
Councillor Adam Stokes
Councillor Mrs Brenda Sumner
Councillor Wilkins

OFFICERS

Head of Development and Growth (Mark Williets)
Development Management Service Manager (Pat Reid)
Area Planning Officers (Philip Moore, Nigel Bryant, Rob Vincent)
Planning Enforcement Officer (Mick Clift)
Committee Support Officer (Malcolm Hall)
Assistant Solicitor (Paul Rushworth)

OTHER MEMBERS

Councillor Ian Stokes
Councillor Mrs Cartwright
Councillor Miss Channell

(In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 24.5, Councillor Miss Channell spoke in connection with application RV1)

69. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors King and Wren.

70. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Wilkins declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application JJ1 as he was employed by the agent for the application.

Councillor Morgan declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application PWM1 as she had extensively lobbied against approval of the application, and

in KJC1, to avoid the impression of bias.

Councillor Brenda Sumner declared a personal interest in application NB3, as former secretary of the Outdoor Bowls Club in Stamford.

Councillor Powell declared a personal interest in application JJ1, as a member of Bourne Town Council, and also a personal interest in application RV1, as she knew one of the public speakers on the application.

Councillor Judy Smith declared a personal interest in application JJ1, as a member of Bourne Town Council.

Councillor Adam Stokes declared a personal interest in application KJC1 (later in the meeting), as a Member of the site owner (Lincolnshire County Council).

71. MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 10 JANUARY 2012

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2012 were approved as a correct record of decisions taken.

72. PLANNING MATTERS

Decision:-

To determine applications or make observations as listed below:-

(1:10pm – Councillor Wilkins left the meeting, having declared an interest).

JJ1

Application ref: S11/2953/MJRF

Description: Demolition of all buildings on site (except mill building which is to be retained and refurbished) and redevelopment of site to create 7 retail units at ground floor level (Use Classes A1, A2, A3), 4 new apartments in refurbished mill building and 10 new-build apartments at 1st/2nd floor over new retail space. Future phase 2 land to be grassed and landscaped. Alterations to adjacent Burghley Street car park

Location: Land off Burghley Street, Bourne

Decision: Deferred

Noting comments made during the public speaking from

Trevor Holmes – Bourne Town Council

Ms E Beckett – objecting
Paul Fieldhouse – agent

together with an objection from Bourne Town Council, comments from the Lincolnshire Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor, Community Leisure Officer, Lincolnshire County Council Children's Services, Planning Policy team, Lincolnshire County Council Highways, English Heritage and Anglian Water, no objection from Environmental Health or the Environment Agency, comments from the Conservation Officer and representations from nearby residents together with a note of the Section 106 Heads of Terms; late information report circulated to Members present at the meeting including a note that the Highway Authority raise no objection subject to conditions, a note of amended plans and a Heritage Impact Assessment, no objection from Natural England and officer comments on the information submitted together with a change to the recommendation in regard to the receipt of a Unilateral Undertaking to secure highway works and a Traffic Regulation Order, and additional conditions; report of site inspection and comments made by Members at the meeting.

It was proposed, seconded and agreed that the application be deferred for determination by the Development Management Service Manager, after consultation with the Chairman, subject to the summary of reasons referred to in the case officer's report, subject to the receipt of a Unilateral Undertaking to secure the highway works and Traffic Regulation Orders, and to appropriate conditions, to include the conditions in the main and late reports.

(2:00pm – Councillor Wilkins returned to the meeting).

KJC1

Application ref:	S11/0967/MJRF
Description:	Demolition of 49 St. Catherine's Road and 1A Dudley Road and construction of retirement accommodation for the elderly including provision of communal facilities, landscaping and car parking
Location:	49 St. Catherine's Road, Grantham, NG31 9DE
Decision:	Deferred

(Councillor Morgan spoke in accordance with the provisions in the Constitution, and, having declared a personal and prejudicial interest left the meeting at 2:25pm).

Noting comments during the public speaking session from:-

Jenny Johnson – objecting

Robyn Longden – objecting
Marilyn Campbell – objecting
Anne Gayfer – objecting
Alice Brown – objecting
Lisa Matthewson – agent

together with comments from the Highway Authority, Anglian Water, Environment Agency, Open Space Officer, Lincolnshire Community Health Services, Historic Environment Officer (Archaeology), Crime Prevention Officer, Environmental Protection, Tree Officer and Planning Policy, confirmation from English Heritage that the building does not meet the criteria for designation in a national context, lengthy comments from the Acting Principal Conservation Officer, comments from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and representations (including a petition) objecting from nearby residents and letters in support, together with a note of the required Section 106 Heads of Terms; late information report circulated to Members at the meeting, including the applicant's response to Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust's initial comments, a response from the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust to the applicant's comments, together with the officer comments thereon and Committee briefing notes prepared by the applicant and by local residents, report of site inspection and comments made by Members at the meeting.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved. Following further lengthy discussion, an amendment was proposed to defer a decision on the application pending a review of the design to reduce the size and bulk of the buildings and to reconsider the car parking and access arrangements and if possible to incorporate the existing building into the scheme.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried, and on being put as the substantive motion was also carried. The proposal was therefore deferred to a future meeting for the reasons noted above.

(The meeting adjourned from 3:51pm to 4:13pm).

(Councillor Morgan returned to the meeting on its resumption).

KJC2

Application ref:	S11/2206/FULL
Description:	Demolition of public house and construction of fast food takeaway with associated restaurant
Location:	Isaac Newton Public House, Harlaxton Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 7SA
Decision:	Refused

Noting comments from Environmental Protection, Environmental Health (Food Hygiene), the Archaeological Consultant, Inland Drainage Board, Police Architectural Liaison Officer, Planning Policy, the Highway Authority and a number of representations from nearby residents and a note of the Section 106 Heads of Terms; late information report circulated to Members present at the meeting including a letter of objection from a nearby resident, additional Highway comments and officer comments thereon, together with additional conditions required by the Highway Authority, report of site inspection and comments made by Members at the meeting.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, the proposition was lost.

It was then proposed that the application be deferred for further discussions with the applicants with regard to an amended plan incorporating a re-design of the building and consideration being given to the access being off Springfield Road.

A general discussion then ensued, and the Committee Support Officer and Assistant Solicitor gave advice on procedure for the information of Members.

As an amendment, it was proposed and seconded that the application be refused, on grounds of design appearance potential and anti-social behaviour and also on highway safety grounds. The Development Management Service Manager advised that he considered that the Committee could make a decision at this meeting without further deferral based on the above reasons. The amendment was then put to the vote and carried and on being put as the substantive motion was also carried. The application was therefore refused for the following reasons:-

1. The proposal by virtue of design and materials would have an industrial/commercial appearance detrimental to the character and appearance of the area on this prominent route into Grantham. As such the proposal would be contrary to policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy. The proposal would not be appropriate to the quality and character of the built fabric and its setting.
2. The proposed vehicular access from Harlaxton Road in close proximity to the existing junction would be likely to result in vehicles queuing and waiting to the detriment of highway safety and the free flow of traffic. As such the proposal would be contrary to PPG 13 - Transport.
3. The proposed use would be likely to result in congregations of customers and members of the public at unsociable hours resulting in noise and disturbance and antisocial behavior to the detriment of the amenities of nearby residents. As such the proposed use would be contrary to policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy and PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development.

PWM1

Application ref: S11/2065/FULL

Description: Residential development – 8 dwellings (including demolition of former hotel)

Location: Shirley Croft Hotel, Harrowby Road, Grantham, NG31 9EA

Decision: Refused

Prior to discussion taking place on this application, the Committee Support Officer gave advice in relation to public speaking for the benefit of Members (Councillors Mrs Kaberry-Brown and Howard) who had not been present at the meeting on 18 October 2011.

(Councillor Morgan spoke in accordance with the provisions in the Constitution, and, having declared a personal and prejudicial interest left the meeting at 4:55pm).

Noting comments during the public speaking session from:-

Jim Smith – objecting

together with comments from the Highway Authority, no objection from the arboriculturalist, comments from the Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board, Grantham Civic Trust and SKDC Principal Conservation Officer, together with a number of letters and a petition of objection from nearby residents and letters in support and, in relation to the amended plans, a further eight letters of objection; late information report circulated to Members present at the meeting including further letters of objection and a petition from residents of St. Vincent's Road, officer comments thereon and changes to the recommendations to include an amended schedule of conditions, together with comments from Members at the meeting.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused, as being over-dominant and having an adverse impact on the residents of neighbouring properties. The Development Management Service Manager advised that he considered the Committee could make a decision at this meeting, without further deferral, based on the above reasons. The proposition was put to the vote and carried, and the application was refused for the following reason:

1. It is considered that single storey dwellings only would be acceptable on plots 5 - 8 and that the proposed dwellings on these plots would not be in keeping with the form and character of the area contrary to national planning policy given in PPS1 (Sustainable Development), PPS3 (Housing), policies 1, 2 & 3 of The East Midlands Regional Plan and policies SP1, H1 & EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy.

2. It is considered that the proposed dwellings on plots 5 - 8 would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of occupiers of the adjacent dwellings on Croft Drive and St Vincent's Road from overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy and by creating a dominant and oppressive environment, contrary to national planning policy given in PPS1 (Sustainable Development).

(5:10pm – Councillor Cook left the meeting).
(5:10pm – Councillor Morgan returned to the meeting).

PWM2

Application ref: S11/2371/HSH

Description: Retention of two conservatories, veranda, extension to Coach House and various structures within the curtilage (including fountain, fencing, CCTV cameras and landscaping works), erection of leisure building, greenhouse and cold frames within existing walled garden, construction of tennis court

Location: Caythorpe Hall, Church Lane, Caythorpe, Grantham, NG32 3EL

Decision: Deferred

Noting comments during the public speaking session from:-

Pete Sowerby – applicant

together with comments from the Community Archaeologist, the Ramblers' Association and Caythorpe Parish Council, lengthy observations from English Heritage recommending refusal, comments from the SKDC Conservation Officer and a statement from the applicant's agent, together with one comment from a local resident, report of site inspection and comments made by Members at the meeting.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved. After discussion, the proposition was withdrawn and it was proposed and seconded that further consideration be deferred on the planning and listed building application pending an application endorsed by the Committee being made to the Secretary of State. On being put to the vote, this proposition was agreed.

PWM3

Application ref: S11/2372/LB

Description: Extensions and alterations to listed building including

retention of two conservatories, veranda, and extension to Coach House, erection of leisure building and greenhouse within existing walled garden, replacement Coach House doors and other associated works

Location: Caythorpe Hall, Church Lane, Caythorpe, Grantham, NG32 3EL

Decision: Deferred

Noting comments made during the public speaking session from:-

Pete Sowerby – applicant

together with comments from the Community Archaeologist and Caythorpe Parish Council, lengthy observations from English Heritage objecting to the proposal, comments from the SKDC Conservation Officer and a statement from the applicant's agent, together with observations from a nearby resident; late information report circulated to Members present at the meeting including a further representation supporting the application for listed building consent from a local resident and officer comments thereon together with a recommended amendment to the reasons for refusal, report of site inspection and comments made by Members at the meeting.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved. After discussion, the proposition was withdrawn and it was proposed and seconded that further consideration be deferred on the planning and listed building application pending an application endorsed by the Committee being made to the Secretary of State. On being put to the vote, this proposition was agreed.

(The meeting adjourned from 6:00pm-6:10pm).
(6:00pm – Councillor Mrs Brenda Sumner left the meeting).

NB1

Application ref: S11/0979/FULL

Description: New driveway to residential property

Location: The Old Rectory, Carlby Road, Greatford, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4PR

Decision: Approved

Prior to discussion taking place on this application, the Committee Support Officer gave advice in relation to public speaking for the benefit of Members (Councillors Mrs Kaberry-Brown and Howard) who had not been present at the meeting on 13 December 2011.

Noting no objection from the Highway Authority, comments from the Parish Council and comments from Lincolnshire Heritage, Natural England, the Environment Agency, Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, Consultant Arboriculturalist and SKDC Property and Facilities, representations from nearby residents and comments from Ecological Consultant and confirmation from Natural England and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust that there was no objection to the proposal with regard to its impact on protected species, 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. Any gates to the vehicular access shall be set back a minimum of 5.0 metres from the nearside edge of the carriageway of Carlby Road and shall not open over the highway.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans submitted as part of the application:

   2011/08-01G
   11016/S/G22/030

4. As identified in the submitted tree survey, the drive shall be constructed using no dig construction techniques and a plan showing a section through the drive shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drive shall be constructed in accordance with the details as approved.

5. A sample of materials to be used for the drive shall be submitted to and approved in writing. The details as approved shall be used in construction of the drive.

6. Before development is commenced on site all existing trees shown on the approved plan shall be fenced off to the limit of their branch spread. No works (including removal of earth), storage of materials, vehicular movements or siting of temporary buildings shall be permitted within these protected areas.

7. No development shall take place until full details of soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. Soft landscape works shall include a schedule of plants, noting species, plant

sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate.

Note(s) to Applicant

1. Erection of flow control structures or any culverting of a watercourse requires the prior written approval of the Environment Agency under s.23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 or s.109 of the Water Resources Act 1991. The Environment Agency resists culverting on nature conservation and other grounds and consent for such works will not normally be granted except for access crossings.

2. Please note that this grant of planning permission does not authorise the change of use of the paddock to residential curtilage and any future developments on this land are likely to require the submission of a planning application.

3. Should any protected species be found during the construction of the drive work should cease and contact be made with appropriate organisations to ensure that identified species are not harmed.

NB2

Application ref: S11/1384/CAC

Description: Demolition of timber buildings in Conservation Area

Location: The Old Rectory, Carlby Road, Greatford, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4PR

Decision: Approved

Prior to discussion taking place on this application, the Committee Support Officer gave advice in relation to public speaking for the benefit of Members (Councillors Mrs Kaberry-Brown and Howard) who had not been present at the meeting on 13 December 2011.

Noting comments from Heritage Lincolnshire, the Parish Council and Natural England, no objection from the Environment Agency or Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, objections from nearby residents and comments from Ecological Consultant and confirmation from Natural England and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust that there was no objection to the proposal with regard to its impact on protected species; site inspection report and comments from Members made 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 works hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration

of three years from the date of this consent.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans submitted as part of the application:

   2011/08 02b

3. Before development is commence on site all existing trees shown on the approved plan shall be fenced off to the limit of their branch spread. No works (including removal of earth), storage of materials, vehicular movements or siting of temporary buildings shall be permitted within these protected areas.

Note(s) to Applicant

1. Should protected species be found on site during the demolition of the structures work would need to cease immediately and contact be made with appropriate authorities or qualified individuals who have the authority to handle such animals.

NB3

Application ref: S11/1689/FULL

Description: Erection of club house (amendments to permission S10/2679)

Location: Stamford and District Indoor Bowling Club Ltd, Exeter Gardens, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2SA

Decision: Approved

Prior to discussion taking place on this application, the Committee Support Officer gave advice in relation to public speaking for the benefit of Members (Councillors Mrs Kaberry-Brown and Howard) who had not been present at the meeting on 13 December 2011.

(6:25pm – Councillor Mrs Kaberry-Brown left the meeting).
(6:28pm – Councillor Mrs Kaberry-Brown returned to the meeting).

Noting submissions in support from the applicant, comments from Lincolnshire Heritage, no objection from the Highway Authority, Planning Policy or Sport England and comments from Stamford Town Council together with objections from nearby residents; late information report circulated at the meeting including further letters from local residents objecting to the proposal (printed in full in the report), comments from Environmental Health and additional information from the applicant together with officer comment on the information received, 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 arrangements shown on the approved plan 2010/20-01d, dated 19 July 2011, for the parking/turning of vehicles shall be available at all times when the premises are in use.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans submitted as part of the application:

   2010/20 - 01d
   2010/20 - 02h

3. All hard and soft landscape works, including a replacement tree and grassed areas (drawing number 2010/20 02h), shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out in the first available planting season or in accordance with the programme agreed with the local planning authority.

4. The building shall not be used outside the hours of 9:00 – 23:00 Monday – Friday and 12:00 – 22:00 Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holidays.

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. During the hours of darkness it is respectfully requested that curtains to the high level windows in the rear elevation are closed.

(6.45pm - Councillor Ashberry left the meeting)

RV1

Application ref:	S11/2949/FULL
Description:	Erection of two polytunnels in connection with horticultural business
Location:	The Old Bakehouse, Main Street, Manthorpe, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0JE
Decision:	Approved

Noting comments made during the public speaking session from:-

Councillor Miss Channell – local representative

(6:48pm – Councillor Ashberry returned to the meeting).

Michael Thompson – objecting
Mike Dawson – supporting
Penny Dawson – applicant

together with comments from the local representative, no objection from the Highway Authority or parish council, a number of letters of objection and in support, 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. The horticultural buildings hereby permitted shall only be used for the purposes of, and in conjunction with the field used for horticulture by the applicants and shall not be used to house livestock.

3. The scheme for hedge planting on the southern boundary of the site and supplementary planting to the eastern and northern boundaries of the site shall be implemented in the next available planting season, as shown on the A3 landscaping plan received 25 November 2011. Any hedging removed, dying, becoming seriously damaged or deceased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced by hedging of a similar size and species to that originally planted.

4. Deliveries to the premises authorised by this permission shall not take place outside the hours of 8am to 5pm Monday to Friday, 8am to 1pm on Saturday and at no time on a Sunday or Bank Holiday.

5. No part of the site or buildings hereby permitted shall be used for retail sales without the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

73. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT BRIEFING PAPER

The Committee noted briefing paper PLA922 from the Planning Enforcement Officer summarising the level of enforcement activity for the period July to December 2011. Also included was an update in relation to Section 106 activity and Section 106 monies received. The Planning Enforcement Officer answered

questions from Members and indicated that in response to Section 106 queries he would ensure that the Section 106 Officer replied to Members as soon as possible. Members noted the report.

74. INFORMATION RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND OTHER PLANNING ACTIVITY

The Development Management Service Manager submitted his report PLA923 listing details of applications not determined within the 8-week time period. Also submitted was a list of applications dealt with under delegated powers and a planning appeals update/summary including copies of appeal decisions as at the end of January 2012.

In response to queries from Members, the Assistant Solicitor and Development Management Service Manager gave an update in relation to the development at Ford End, Gonerby Road, Grantham, and indicated that a full report would be submitted to a future meeting.

75. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 7:18pm.

COMMITTEE: 6 MARCH 2012

	NO	PAGE	PROPOSAL AND LOCATION	REC
KJC1	11/2511	1	Outline application for the redevelopment of Station Approach area, involving necessary demolitions and the construction of public realm; residential development, offices and incubator units, hotel and leisure, retail and community uses together with the associated creation and modification of vehicular and pedestrian access. Grantham Station Approach, between Grantham Railway Station and Wharf Road, Grantham	AC
PWM1	11/1922	36	Two wind turbines (hub height 29.6 m, rotor diameter 20m and total ground to tip height 39.6m) and associated works. Lodge Farm, Main Street, Carlton Scroop, Grantham, NG32 3AU	AC
NB1	11/2957	51	Erection of a public house/restaurant, access, parking and associated works and ancillary accommodation. Land at South Road, Bourne	AC
NB2	11/2665	61	Two storey side and rear extension, single storey side Extension. Timber clad and pitch roof over existing garage and erection of boundary wall. Walnut Cottage, Main Street, Braceborough, Stamford PE9 4NT	R
SP1	11/2864	65	Revised outline application to provide two one-and-a-half Storey dwellings. Rear of Holmleigh, Honington Road, Barkston, Grantham, NG32 2NG	AC
TF1	11/2762	71	Installation of portakabin for use of daytime café and evening security office. The Fox Inn, Great North Road, South Witham, Grantham, NG33 5LN	AC
TF2	12/0008	76	Change of Use of existing building in south-east corner of site from Use Class B2 (general industry) to Use Class D2 (dance studio) and Change of Use of part existing building in south-west corner of site from Use Class D2 (dance studio) to Use Class B1 (to allow expansion of existing offices). Global Centre, 113 Spalding Road, Deeping St James, PE6 8SD	AC
LDPP1	11/2613	80	Proposed extensions to dwelling and removal of garage. Ford End, Gonerby Road, Grantham, NG31 8HU	AC
PL1	11/2557	84	Outline application for 2 single storey dwellings. 22b Burghley Street, Bourne, PE10 9NS	AC

PL2	12/0185	89	New window, obscure glazed in 1st floor west elevation, replace ground floor window with door. Corn Exchange, 3 Abbey Road, Bourne, PE10 9EF	AC

AGENDA ITEM

Development Control Committee
6 March 2012

KJC1 **S11/2511/EIAOL** Target Decision Date: 14-Feb-2012

Applicant	**Mr Paul Wheatley, Lincolnshire County Council** Beech House, Witham Park, Waterside South, Lincoln, LN5 7JH
Agent	Mr Roger Prescott, Mouchel Export House, Cawsey Way, Woking, Surrey, GU21 6QX
Proposal	**Outline application for the redevelopment of Station Approach area, involving necessary demolitions and the construction of public realm; residential development, offices and incubator units, hotel and leisure, retail and community uses together with the associated creation and modification of vehicular and pedestrian access**
Location	**Grantham Station Approach, between Grantham Railway Station and Wharf Road, Grantham**
App Type	OL Environmental Impact Assessment
Parish(es)	Grantham

REPORT

Application Category

This application is categorised as a major development.

Reason for Referral to Committee

The application has been referred to the Development Control Committee because the application relates to a major project that is likely to cause wider concern.

The Proposal

The development is described in the Non Technical Summary of the submitted Environmental Statement:

Lincolnshire County Council is proposing a mixed use business centre redevelopment of the area adjacent to the Grantham Railway Station to link both the rail station and town centre. The project seeks to:

Provide a connected public realm
Create sustainable transport solutions
Improve and diversify the town retail offer; and
Create a town of different parts.

The land uses proposed are residential, office, retail, incubator units (managed workspaces catering for new start ups, community businesses or locally developed micro businesses helping them to grow), hotel, leisure and community uses.

The development would be progressed in three phases. The site is split into two parts – site 1a and site 1b to delineate the boundaries of the development phases.

The development phases would be:

Phase 1 – initial works – clearing the site 1a and construction of public realm areas, temporary uses (30 space car park and grass area) possibly a hotel and incubator units with 18 car parking). In addition the improvements to Station Road and the area outside the train station. Site 1b would remain as car parks.

Phase 1 - remaining works – construction of residential and office buildings within site 1a. Site 1b would remain as car parks.

Phase 2 –Removal of car parks and construction of residential, community, business premises and public areas in site b, as well as any additional works to the area outside the train station.

A pragmatic approach has been taken to the implementation of the proposals given the present severe economic climate. It is anticipated that Phase 1 would be undertaken within 1-5 years of planning permission being granted.

The southern part of the site would be developed beyond this period as Phase 2.

The planning application is in outline form. The matters to be considered at this stage are access and scale. All other matters are reserved for subsequent approval.

There would be a mix of one (4 metre to the highest part of roof) to four storeys (16 metres to the highest part of the roof).

Movement within the Scheme

The submitted design and access statement indicates that primary vehicle movement would continue along Wharf Road as existing, with secondary and local movements within the residential streets to the east of development. Accessing and servicing only would be available the eastern and western edge, to emphasise the subservient role of vehicles within the site's centre.

Vehicles

Vehicles would have restricted access in front of the station, which would be for buses only, plus loading outside peak hours. The station frontage would also incorporate a taxi rank and a kiss-and-drop' point.

Pedestrians

Two primary pedestrian routes would be created one following the central axis from the station towards Wharf Road north and west, and the other branching off along Railway Terrace to Wharf Road north to east. Signalised crossing would be provided at the main junction north-west of the development and towards the Isaac Newton Shopping centre, and courtesy crossing on Station Road.

Secondary routes would continue along Wharf Road, but would be retained along Station Road. Local access would be flexible, permitting a variety of routes eastwards, and notably improving the access under the railway to the west.

Public Realm Hierarchy

The public realm through the development would be the strong design principle. Station Square would seek to deliver a welcoming arrival space between arrival areas leading to multimodal options for moving into and beyond the development facilities.

The station square would be set directly opposite the station entrance, with additional multi-modal arrival areas to both sides, filtering travellers in a convenient way towards destinations. To the north, Station Road would become a conventional street, connecting with the major junction of Wharf Road and Harlaxton Road at the north-western corner of the site.

The remaining public realm would be set parallel and at right angles to the existing street pattern east of the site, with the exception of the partly pedestrianised and partly shared space Railway Terrace, which leads on a north-easterly direction from the station towards the shopping area of Wharf Road, and then to the town centre.

The central axis would dominate the development as the major pedestrian link, and would incorporate a pedestrianised open space in the centre. To the west of this access would be private space, acting partly as a screen between the development and the listed Railway Cottages. The private space would be split on both east and west sides of the residential buildings which would be set either side of the open space.

To the north and east, space behind the proposed hotel would be semi-private and to the south there would be a link between Railway Terrace and Launder Terrace.

There would be short pedestrianised and/or private cross-site links would occur at frequent intervals along the central axis.

Parking

The scheme is designed to reduce the attractiveness of driving to the site by limiting the number of both on-street parking spaces on site 1 and enforcing those that are provided, but also actively promoting the sites location and implementing measures to encourage sustainable behaviours. This is based on the fact that it is recognised that the majority of the parking would be provided on site 2.

When phase 1a is developed it is intended to build a multi-storey car park to the south east of the station. Although this forms part of site 2 it would be brought forward to ensure that parking level were maintained as site 1 is developed.

Further explanation as to the rationale behind the parking provision can be found in the Officer Assessment of this report.

Phasing

The proposed phasing strategy would split the development into two.

The proposed phasing strategy would be to split the development into two. Part of this strategy would be to develop the site according to defined sites 1A and 1B, which are partly defined by land ownership, but also according to agreed priorities and in a logistical way, taking into account the maintenance of site access, temporary use of undeveloped areas and economic requirements. The boundary between sites 1A and 1B is Railway Terrace from its junction with Queen Street south-west to its junction with Station Road.

Treatment of parts of the site not being developed immediately would consider the needs of the community during the development process.

Site 1, Phase A (Initial Works)
Phase 1 would be further divided into an initial phase of work (approx years 1-5) and a secondary phase. The first works would include most of Site 1A including the hotel, incubator units and much of the public realm including the section of Station Road up to the station (see Proposed Site 1 – Phase A Initial Works, Plan 4).

An existing building with heritage and architectural value would be retained and secured prior to future phases of development. The public realm works would include the central axis, to promote convenient pedestrian access to the station. Other works would be to renew the Zebra crossing and beacons on Station Road, add a build-out and footway to serve subway users, provide a vehicle turning area, a taxi rank, a bus stop, a new cycle shelter and a 'kiss-&-ride' location, all defined with coloured surfacing to denote restricted access areas for buses and taxis.

Much of the undeveloped land would be used for temporary car-parking or grassed open space with temporary tree and shrub planting. Site 1B would also remain as car-parking. The ramped steps to the higher levels to Site 1B would be installed.

The second part of Phase 1 (see Proposed Site 1 – Phase A Remaining Works, Plan 5) would be the construction of the remaining commercial and residential buildings in Site 1A. This would include offices, offices over retail, and residential, including some residential over offices.

Site 1B would still remain as car-parking.

Site 1 Phase B

The second phase is all within Site 1B, and would include upgrading materials in front of the station (see Proposed Site 1 – Phase B, Plan 6) This last phase would include completion of the building works in Site 1B, comprising additional offices on either side of the remaining link to the central axis, a community block on the eastern boundary, along with a leisure facility with residential above, and residential over retail forming the eastern side of the Station Square.

Improvements to the public realm along Queen Street would also be carried out in the final phase, plus upgrading of the Station Square.

Works Access

Access to the works during Phase 1 of construction would be via Grantley Street and during Phase 2 of construction would be via Station Road.

During peak construction periods the maximum number of HGV movements per day would be agreed with South Kesteven District Council prior to commencement of works. The construction works would be undertaken during normal working hours, including limited Saturday working. The possible exception would be close to construction completion, when traffic switching would be required to allow tie-in to the existing roads. This would be a short-term activity with prior approval being sought from the highways department.

The future appointed construction contractor would be contractually obligated to maintain a duty of care and undertake their works to satisfy statutory obligations. They would be made to work under the remit of a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) that would require Council signoff prior to construction and see the works being closely and independently monitored

throughout. By that means, strong control would be exercised over matters such as hours of working, and noise levels generated by works, so safeguarding amenity of existing properties and commercial uses.

Key construction activities would include:

• selective vegetation clearance;
• protection of retained buildings, features and trees
• building demolition, removal of former underground storage tanks, sitestripping, soil remediation (if required) levelling and earthworks using conventional earth moving equipment;
• crushing of concrete and other base materials, and their re-use on site, where practicable;
• use of generators to power temporary lighting and run machines;
• vehicle movements to deliver and dispose of excess materials;
• road laying and compaction activities along with the breaking-out of areas to locate lighting columns, services and other infrastructure;
• highway drainage and associated outfalls;
• building construction and fit-out;
• hard and soft landscape works, including installation of street furniture and public art works.

The application is one that falls to be considered under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulation. An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken and an Environmental Statement (ES) has been submitted with the application. The ES considers the impact of the development under the following headings:

- Land Quality and Hydrogeology
- Flooding and Drainage
- Ecology and Nature Conservation
- Townscape and Visual Impact
- Cultural Heritage
- Air Quality
- Noise and Vibration
- Cumulative Impacts

A Transport Assessment, an explanatory note in relation to parking also accompanied the planning application.

Revised chapters of the ES and Transport Assessment have been submitted as part of the response to consultee comments. They revise the above issues where appropriate.

As part of the procedure for Environmental Impact Assessments the Government Office and a number of other statutory bodies are required to be notified. This procedure has taken place on both the initial and revised submissions.

The application site and surroundings

The application site is roughly triangular and is approximately 3 hectares. It has a mix of current uses that include a small element of residential, tyre fitting business, building suppliers and car parking associated with the railway.

The northern portion of the site contains a number of linear buildings that align with the street pattern to the east. To the north west of the application site adjacent to the junction with Wharf Road are the listed Railway Cottages. The listed buildings are not within application site.

The site is bounded by differing uses. To the north is a mix of residential and town centre uses, to the west is the railway, and to the east is residential and to the south is car parking.

The application is predominantly flat from west to east. The south of the application site is approximately 7 metres higher than the frontage of the site adjacent to Wharf Road.

Relevant Site History

The site has been the subject of a number of planning applications. However none are specifically relevant to this current planning application.

92/0674 – Change of use of part of site to a skating rink – granted on 4 August 1992

94/0100 – Alteration of time limit condition of planning permission 92/0674 – granted on 29 March 1994.

96/0563 – County Matter application – Storage of spoil. Refused on 16 July 1996.

S99/0910 – Change of use to car park of former shoe factory Granted 7 December 1999.

S01/1415 – Security fencing – Tanvic Tyres – Granted 7 January 2002.

S01/1459 – Change of use of part of site from D2 to B1 and B2 uses – Application withdrawn. No further action as the requested transport statement was not received.

S01/1489 – Change of use application of part of site from D2 to B8 – Application withdrawn. No further action as the requested transport statement was not received.

S02/0887 – Security fence – Tanvic Tyres – granted 5 August 2002.

S02/1084 – Security fence to former shoe factory – granted 30 September 2002.

S10/0816 – Screening opinion Requested EIA required – 13 May 2010. This relates to the redevelopment of three sites including the subject of this planning application (S11/2511).

Policy Considerations

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS3 – Housing
PPS4 – Planning for the Sustainable Economic Growth
PPS5 – Planning and the Historic Environment
PPS9 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
PPG13 – Transport
PPG17 – Planning for Open space, Sport and Recreation
PPS23 – Planning and Pollution Control
PPG24 – Planning and Noise
PPS25 – Development and Flood Risk

East Midlands Regional Plan

Policy 1 – Regional Core Objectives
Policy 2 – Promoting Better Design
Policy 3 – Distribution of New Development
Policy 4 – Development in the Eastern Sub area
Policy 13a – Regional Housing provision
Policy 14 – Regional Priorities for affordable housing
Policy 18 – Regional Priorities for the economy
Policy 22 – Regional Priorities for Town Centres and Retail Development
Policy 26 – Protecting and Enhancing the Region's Natural and Cultural Heritage
Policy 27 – Regional Priorities for the Historic Environment
Policy 32 – A Regional Approach to Water Resources and Water Quality
Policy 35 – A Regional Approach to Managing Flood Risk
Policy 48 – Regional Car Parking Standards

South Kesteven Core Strategy

SP1 – Spatial Strategy
SP3 – Sustainable Integrated Transport
SP4 – Developer Contributions
EN1 – Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District
EN2 – Reducing the Risk of Flood Risk
EN4 – Sustainable Construction and Design
H1 – Residential Development
H3 – Affordable Housing
E1 – Employment Development
E2 – Town Centre and Retail Development

Station Approach Development Brief – Adopted October 2010

Its principles and aims which it seeks to achieve are:

a) a clear connection between the station and the town centre
b) a distinctive arrival point for Grantham by creating a station square
c) An engaging route through a series of urban spaces that encourage people to visit the town centre
d) a versatile character area with a sustainable mix of employment and residential uses
e) appropriate scale and massing of development that respects the listed buildings and adjacent residential area
f) reduced provision of car parking to minimum standards and
g) creating a public transport interchange with bus services extended to the railway station.

Grantham Area Action Plan – emerging

The Grantham Area Action Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State on 19th December 2011 and the Site Allocation and Policies on the 31st January 2012 in line with Regulation 30 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations.

The role of an Inspector acting on behalf of the SoS is to consider whether a document is legally compliant i.e. meets the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and associated regulations and satisfies the criteria for soundness i.e. whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Policy MOV1 – Movement and Accessibility
Policy RT1 – Improving Town Centre Retail Offer
Policy SA1 – Station Approach
Policy OSS1 – Open Space Provision
Policy HS1 – New Housing Development
Policy EM2 – New Employment Allocations
Policy HE1 – Townscape Character

Representations Received

Affordable Housing Officer

- All developments comprising 5 or more dwellings should make appropriate provision for affordable housing within the development. On small sites of between 5-14 housing units provision may be made on site; off site or as a commuted sum in lieu of provision, depending on the viability of the individual site.
- Where affordable housing is to be provided on site, a target of up to 35% of the total capacity of a scheme should be affordable. The affordable element will be expected to include a mix of social rented and intermediate (shared ownership) housing appropriate to the current evidence of local need.
- All units should be of an appropriate size and type to meet the need identified by the current evidence of housing need.
- Consideration may be given to off site provision or as a commuted sum in lieu of provision of the affordable homes on site if it is not viable to provide the affordable units on site. Evidence will be required that on site provision is not viable.

Footpaths Officer

There are no public rights of way affected by this development

Police Architectural Liaison Officer

Due regard to be given to the following points in the interests of crime reduction and community safety.

The development hereby permitted shall incorporate measures to minimise the risk of crime and to meet the specific security needs of the application site and the development. Details of these measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and implemented in accordance with the approved details. The security measures must incorporate the principles and objectives of secured by design to improve community safety and crime prevention.

(Officer Comment – As this is an outline planning application there are no details of the design of the buildings. At reserved matters stage the police would be invited to assess the scheme and comment further. As such there is no requirement for this condition).

Highways Agency

Offers no objection

Open Space Officer

I do not think there is space for open space provision on site. So I would request an off-site contribution of £44,625. This would be used to improve play equipment in the vicinity specifically Alexandra Road.

Environmental Protection

Initial comments

With regard to the above application I would comment as follows;

1. In relation to the commercial use of the site; I am concerned about disturbance to residents, particularly the existing residents in the area around the proposed retail units which back onto Launder Terrace/Queen Street. It would appear that deliveries to these units are likely to be made via Launder Terrace/Queen Street which is a narrow street with residential properties at the kerbside. I am also concerned about disturbance to those living on the proposed site. In view of this I would suggest that a delivery hours restriction be applied to the commercial elements of the site to be between the hours of 07:30 to 18:00 Monday to Saturday and 08:00 to 16:00 on Sunday's and Bank holidays.

2. Construction noise from the site is likely to be an issue and as such I would request that hours of work for noisy work on site are restricted to 07:30-18:00, Monday to Friday, 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturday and no noisy work on a Sunday or Bank Holiday. Any deviation to these hours must be agreed in writing in advance. The measures proposed in section 13.7.11 of the Environmental Statement shall also be undertaken in relation to construction noise.

3. Details of any fixed plant e.g. refrigeration and air conditioning units etc will need to be submitted and agreed prior to installation. Fixed plant should not be located on facades facing directly onto either proposed or existing residential properties.

4. To protect the majority of people from being seriously annoyed during the daytime, the World Health Organisation Guidelines for Community noise suggest that the sound pressure level on balconies, terraces and outdoor living areas should not exceed 55 dB LAeq for a steady, continuous noise. The noise assessment has found that this level will not be met across the site, subsequently, I would suggest that if the residential units are to have gardens that the occupiers would be seriously annoyed by noise.

5. Based on the noise assessment in relation to PPG24, the majority of the site falls within Categories C and B, with the area marked for the hotel falling within Category D for daytime and C for night time. PPG24 recommends that planning permission should normally be refused where areas fall within Category D. As this is a hotel and not residential I would suggest that suitable mitigation measures could be put in place to achieve good internal noise levels through enhanced glazing and façade treatments, particularly on the Wharf Road side. Alternative means of ventilation will also need to be provided. Details of the design and its effectiveness will need to be provided and agreed prior to development and will dependent on the final design and layout.

   In order to comply with BS8233 the residential elements of the development will need to have an alternative means of ventilation as an open window will result in the criteria not being met. This will need to be either from acoustically treated trickle ventilation or a whole building system. The glazing will also need to be upgraded from standard thermal double glazing to achieve a façade reduction of at least 39dB. Details of the design and its

effectiveness will need to be provided and agreed prior to development and will dependent on the final design and layout.

6. In relation to operation noise from the commercial activities, I am unable to comment on this at this stage as the end usage is unknown. This will have to be considered further at the reserved matters stage.

Natural England

Natural England has no comments to make on this planning proposal. However we would like to stress that the absence of comments or direct involvement on individual plans or proposals is simply an expression of our priorities. It should not be taken as implying a lack of interest or indicating either support for, or objection to, any proposal.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

We support the consultant's recommendations with regard to mitigation for nesting birds and bats. The Trust would strongly encourage the inclusion of biodiversity enhancements within the plans so that there is a net gain for biodiversity resulting from this development. Features for roosting bats, such as bat bricks, access tiles or bat boxes and features for nesting birds such as swifts, swallows and house sparrows could easily be incorporated within the development. We strongly support the mention in the Design and Access Statement of SUDS features such as attenuation ponds as these could have a dual role of enhancing the biodiversity on site if planted with native species. With regards to the planting, we note that a number of exotic species are mentioned in the Design and Access Statement and would suggest that consideration is given to including a greater proportion of native tree and shrub species, preferably of local provenance.

Upper Witham Drainage Board

The Board have no further comments on the above application provided the works are completed in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment contained in the Environmental Statement Volume 3 Appendix 8.5 (11th October, 2011) notably that the discharge is limited to 1.15 litres/sec/ha.

Senior Historic Environment Officer

A condition is required to be attached to any permission granted:

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 in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: in order to provide a reasonable opportunity to record the site history of the site.

Planning Policy

The application is for outline planning permission for the redevelopment of Site 1 of the Grantham Station Approach Area. The site has been the subject of previous consultation through the process of adoption of the supplementary planning Guidance SPG entitled – Station Approach Development Brief. This SPG was adopted in October 2010.

The SPG helped to shape the policy SA1: Station Approach in the emerging Grantham Area Action Plan (not yet adopted). From a review of both the SPG and the policy in the GAAP it would appear

that the proposal is compliant with both. Therefore planning policy has no objection to this outline application.

English Heritage

The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

Environment Agency

Initial Comments

Flood risk

We have considered the application as submitted, and OBJECT to it as the supporting Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is not compliant with the requirements of Annex E of Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk' (PPS25).

Further Comments

Thank you for referring the amended plans and additional document, which were received on 2 February 2012.

Flood risk
We have assessed the submitted information and this is not yet compliant with the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 25, Annex E. Accordingly, we maintain our objection to the proposal for the following reasons:

- The surface water is proposed to drain via an Anglian Water Services (AWS) system before it reaches the culverted section of the Mow Beck. The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will, therefore, need to include and confirm the agreed rate as allowed by AWS. In this instance we would encourage the developer and AWS to consider the potential impacts downstream of the surface water sewer. If there are existing connections we would like to see the existing runoff rates reduced following guidance from Section 7.2.4 of the South Kesteven Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). Section 3.3.1.2 of the FRA refers to seeking this information at the detailed design stage. However, it is our opinion that it is required for outline permission purposes.
- Once the discharge rates have been established the FRA will need to consider how much storage may be required on site. Suitable methods for storing this volume of water will then have to be identified to demonstrate that the site is able to manage surface water runoff without increasing flood risk to third parties. The FRA still contains no calculations on volumes of storage. There is some discussion in the FRA about how Sustainable Drainage can be incorporated into the development but this is still too vague. Without the information on volumes of attenuation storage it is almost impossible to select a viable option. At least one viable option will have to be demonstrated for us to lend our support to the application and recommend a condition for the detailed design.

This development has been discussed at the recent South Kesteven Drainage Group meeting where there were also concerns raised by the County Council in terms of the provision of Sustainable Drainage. The applicants are to be invited to the next meeting. We would strongly recommend that they attend in order to assist with resolving our concerns.

Potential pollution of controlled waters
The corrections relating to the hydrogeological designations at the site appear to have been taken on board, improving the understanding of site conditions. However, the Environmental Statement, Chapters 7 and 8 (as amended), disagree in that Chapter 7 relies on the assumption that areas of impermeable hardstanding will increase, reducing risk of infiltration mobilising contamination, and Chapter 8 states that impermeable surfacing will not increase as a result of development. However, we agree with the conclusions that the risk to controlled waters from this development is acceptable.

Comments on Amended Details

We have assessed the submitted information and this is not yet compliant with the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 25, Annex E. Accordingly, we maintain our objection to the proposal for the following reasons:

- The surface water is proposed to drain via an Anglian Water Services (AWS) system before it reaches the culverted section of the Mow Beck. The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will, therefore, need to include and confirm the agreed rate as allowed by AWS. In this instance we would encourage the developer and AWS to consider the potential impacts downstream of the surface water sewer. If there are existing connections we would like to see the existing runoff rates reduced following guidance from Section 7.2.4 of the South Kesteven Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). Section 3.3.1.2 of the FRA refers to seeking this information at the detailed design stage. However, it is our opinion that it is required for outline permission purposes.
- Once the discharge rates have been established the FRA will need to consider how much storage may be required on site. Suitable methods for storing this volume of water will then have to be identified to demonstrate that the site is able to manage surface water runoff without increasing flood risk to third parties. The FRA still contains no calculations on volumes of storage. There is some discussion in the FRA about how Sustainable Drainage can be incorporated into the development but this is still too vague. Without the information on volumes of attenuation storage it is almost impossible to select a viable option. At least one viable option will have to be demonstrated for us to lend our support to the application and recommend a condition for the detailed design.

The applicant continues to have discussions with the Environment Agency to address the concerns raised. Any further comments will be reported in the late items paper or verbally at committee.

Economic Development

The scheme comprises the redevelopment of circa 4 ha (9.88 acres) of a currently under utilised, yet highly visible, gateway site adjacent to the train station which will provide an opportunity to create major employment opportunities and improve connectivity between the town centre and the train station.

It is anticipated that approximately 1000 jobs will be created, many of which higher value than Grantham's average. Over 11,415m² will be dedicated office space with a further 2,240m² for a Business Innovation Centre (BIC).

Grantham has previously been identified as having limited quality office space/business start up workspace for SMEs, (Small and Medium Sized Enterprises) and this project seeks to address this imbalance ahead of the predicted growth for the town and as such is a priority of the Grantham Growth Point Strategic Board. Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners delivered a South Kesteven Employment Land Capacity Study in March 2010 identifying Grantham as having a strong employment land demand with a current shortfall in B1a (office) and B8 (storage/distribution). The

report also found an “overwhelming majority of South Kesteven’s employment space (94%) is industrial” suggesting a strong need to balance this out with commercial office space. The study also states that the office space currently available in the town “tends to be small and poor quality, second hand premises”.

The Business Incubation Centre (BIC) would provide approx 44 units of new start of businesses. The project aims to provide an environment in which SME’s can flourish and grow through the provision of integrated business development support to include incubator space, business support services, clustering and networking opportunities. By providing such support services on a ‘one stop shop’ basis and enabling overheads to be reduced by sharing costs, the centre will significantly improve the survival and growth prospects of new start-ups. Such services will maximise Grantham’s economic role. In May 2010, Focus consultants completed a final Feasibility Study for Station Approach Business Innovation centre confirmed the Station Approach site as the most appropriate site in Grantham to develop the Innovation centre.

The train station is very close to the town centre, although at present there are no clear links to the town centre. This project seeks to rectify this by creating a clear linkage to the town centre and developing the site as a major gateway into the town. A safe and direct pedestrian and cycle link between the town centre core and the railway station will be established. The project seeks to address:

- Creating a sustainable business environment
- Creating clear connections to the rest of Grantham
- Developing a spatial network
- Enhancing Grantham as a destination
- Encouraging urban living
- Creating character areas
- Creating quality employment space

The development is in line with a number of local, regional and national planning policies as listed in the adopted Station Approach development brief. The Grantham Area Action Plan further supports the scheme and a number of SKDC’s priorities are addressed:

- Growing the Economy
    - Supports and facilitates the growth of business
    - Promotes infrastructure to support growth
    - Skills – high value employment
    - Attract as a destination for investment

- Support good housing for all

    - Ensure the right mix of housing meets local needs

SKDC Development and Growth team fully support the proposal based upon the above and fully acknowledge the regeneration opportunities this project can bring.

Environmental Protection (Contamination)

No further sampling is required in relation to gas and water sampling.

I concur with the recommendations of the report namely:

The main contaminants of concern are heavy metals

The remediation measures to facilitate the development of the site as commercial/residential with garden use are:

a) Vented foundation design
b) Membrane for foundations to withstand carbon dioxide
c) Water supply pipe to be determined by Anglian Water but likely to be hydrocarbon resistant.
d) Areas that have not been investigated should be investigated after vacation of the site
e) Ground waters are not deemed at risk and know further assessment is required.

In summary there are no fundamental contamination issues that will delay are add excessive costs to the development of the site.

Environmental Protection – Air Quality

Initial Comments

I am satisfied that there are negligible air quality issues regarding phase 1 of the development.

Local Highway Authority

No objection subject to the following conditions:

HP01 -The access to the development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the indicative plans referenced 1034919-0P-DWG-004/A; 005/A and 006/A dated 25 October 2011 and to a phasing arrangement agreed in writing by the local planning authority

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

HP11A- Before development commences on site further details relating to the vehicular access to the public highway, including materials, specification of works and construction method shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The approved details shall be implemented on site before the development is first brought in to use and thereafter retained at all times.

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

HP12 – Within seven days of any new access being brought into use, all existing vehicular access points serving this development or phase of development shall be re-assesses and if any are considered as being redundant these access crossings shall be permanently closed off.

Reason: To reduce to a minimum the number of individual access points to Station Road, Grantley Street, Queen Street or Wharf Road•. in the interests of road safety.

HP18- When the application is made for approval of the 'Reserved Matters' that application shall show details of the arrangements for the parking /turning/ manoeuvring/loading/unloading of vehicles within the site. These arrangements shall be provided before the building(s) is/are occupied and shall be kept permanently free for such use at all times thereafter.

Reason: To enable calling vehicles to wait clear of the carriageway of Station Road, Queen Street. and Grantley Street and to allow vehicles to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety.

HP21 -No part of the Site 1 Initial Phase of the development shall be commenced (apart from those works indicatively identified on drawing numbers 1034919-0P-DWG-004/A and Figure A - "Site 1 Phase 1 -Access Improvements and On-Site Loading" within the Transport Assessment or as specified) before the works to improve the public highway by means of the reconfiguration of the junction Wharf Road/Grantley Street, widening Grantley Street and realignment of footway(s) and cycleway improvements together with all ancillary works have been certified complete by the local planning authority.

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

HP21 -No development shall be commenced to Site 1 Phase 2 (apart from those works indicatively identified on drawing number 1034919-0P-DWG-006/A or as specified) before the works to improve the public highway (by means of realignment and widening of Queen Street together with all ancillary works) have been certified complete by the local planning authority.

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

HP21 – No 'development shall be commenced to Site 1, Phase 2- drawing number 1034919-0P-DWG-002/A until a comprehensive scheme for highway improvements to Station Road from its junction with Wharf Road/Harlaxton Road up to and including its connection with Station Road East) have been certified complete by the local planning authority.

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

HP21 - No development shall be commenced to Site 1, Phase 2 drawing number 1034919-0P-DWG-002A before the works to improve the public highway by means of until a comprehensive scheme for the signalised junction improvements to Station Road East/London Road has been submitted to, approved, constructed and) have been certified complete by the local planning authority.

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

HP23 - Where roads and footways are to become the responsibility of the local highway authority - before each dwelling (or other development as specified) is occupied the roads and/or footways providing access to those dwellings or units and, for the whole of its frontage, from an existing public highway, shall be constructed to a specification to enable them to be adopted as Highways Maintainable at the Public Expense, less the carriageway and footway surface courses. The carriageway and footway surface courses shall be completed within three months from the date upon which the erection is commenced of the penultimate dwelling (or other development as specified).

Reason: To ensure safe access to the site and each dwelling/building in the interests of residential amenity, convenience and safety.

HP24- 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, amenity and commerce of the residents of this site.

HP26 - Before any dwelling is commenced, all of that part of the estate road and associated footways that forms the junction with the main road and which will be constructed within the limits of the existing highway, shall be laid out and constructed to finished surface levels in accordance with details to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority.

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

HP28- Within 6 months of the development being occupied, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter annually a staff survey shall be analysed and submitted to the local planning authority that will provide details of the implementation of the Travel Plan. The occupier shall ensure that travel arrangements are fulfilled in accordance with the Travel Plan, unless the local planning authority stipulates approval to any variation.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority conforms to the requirements of PPG13 Transport, a Travel Plan has been conditioned to ensure that access to the site is sustainable and reduces dependency on the car.

Prior to the occupation of the development details of how parking will be restricted and altering of the direction of traffic flows shall be implemented in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic.

Primary Care Trust

A request for a contribution of £65,088 is required in this instance in relation to the 72 units proposed on the site (32 houses and 40 flats).

Lincolnshire County Council Education

A request for developer contributions of £166,368 has been received in relation to the direct impact the proposed development would have on local schools.

Conservation Officer

Initial Comments

The outline application relates to the proposals to redevelop Station Approach between Wharf Road and Grantham Railway Station. The application also seeks approval for the proposed public realm works as part of the Phase 1 delivery of Site 1.

There are a number of significant heritage assets within and adjacent to the boundary of the site. To the west of the site boundary is a group of six Grade II listed mid 19th century railway cottages, to the east of the cottages is the 19th century Italianate style former showroom for Boyall's Carriage works currently occupied by Jewsons and to the south is the 19th century railway station. The proposed scheme seeks to retain and incorporate the undesignated showroom into the redevelopment, which is welcomed.

The site currently comprises of a mix of industrial uses, open standing car parks and derelict land and forms a poor quality setting for the heritage assets. The proposal offers the opportunity to enhance the setting of these assets by providing a mix of high quality contemporary buildings and the potential positive townscape benefits are broadly welcomed.

The setting of the station would be enhanced by the provision of a new square and the relocation of car parking to the south of the site. The public realm works and proposed material palette for the main pedestrian links and spaces are of a high quality which will enhance the setting of the heritage assets and provide an attractive link to the town centre. The opportunity to open up a new vista to the Grade II Maltings on Wharf Road is also a positive feature of the scheme.

The proposed building materials palette of red brick and stone combined with a mix of natural and modern materials could work well to create a contemporary identity for the development which acknowledges the wider local and historic context. The materials and colour palette reflect the recommendations highlighted for this character area in the Grantham Townscape Character Assessment.

However there are concerns that the proposals to site 3 storey buildings to the rear of the cottages and to the north and south of the showroom building would dominate the assets and have a harmful impact. These negative impacts could be partially mitigated by the degree of separation to provide access to the rear of the proposed office blocks and by a sensitive design, which responds to the local context.

Comments on Amended Details

I have read through the amended proposals and note what Mouchel/LCC are saying about the retention of the Jewson showroom building but they appear to have interpreted the concerns expressed about the height of the buildings to the rear of the listed building fronting Station Approach as being about privacy/overlooking when in fact, from my point of view at least, it was a concern about the setting of these heritage assets.

That said the retention of the showroom building has gone someway towards addressing the concerns and, if the new build elements and the landscaping of their surroundings are to a high standard of design and materials, there should be an overall enhancement to the setting for the listed buildings over the existing situation with the builders merchants and tyre/exhaust replacement business on the adjoining land.

Network Rail

Initial Comments

I refer to the consultation on the above planning application. As a key landowner and representative of the rail industry we are of course supportive in general of the proposals, but need to consider carefully their impact on the operational functionality of the station.

The principles of the works outside the station are ones we support as they improve the Station environs and create a more attractive route from station to town but we have the following comments:

(1) Site 1 Phase 2 land uses and layout of any new development should be capable of variation to suit future demand from developers/occupiers and not be restricted to the indicative uses shown on the drawings. Scope should also be given to allow for the development of the Phase 2 land to be taken forward in advance of development on Phase 1 if demand for new buildings on the site exists.

(2) The Parking Strategy refers to loss of 70 spaces on Station Approach. Whilst the Strategy identifies that there is capacity elsewhere to replace the use of these spaces it needs to be realised that the provision of the car park spaces is covered by their incorporation into a Franchised Station under the 1993 Railways Act. Therefore, removal of the spaces without replacement to ensure there is not a reduction in total available spaces at the station (not related to current demand) has to be dealt with by appropriate Regulatory processes. This is unlikely to be given if it involves a reduction in the overall total spaces available. Therefore, the 70 spaces would have to be replaced by 70 new car park spaces elsewhere - we are unable to support the detailed proposals for removing the car parking of Station Road without the 70 spaces being replicated elsewhere.
(3) The detailed design of the area outside the station has to be agreed with NR and East Coast. Discussions have been held on this – most recently by East Coast – and hence the final layout should reflect East Coast/NR/LCC agreement. Although consent is sought in the outline application for access and the materials to be used on the immediate area outside the station, these have not yet been agreed with either ourselves or East Coast. We would therefore suggest that notwithstanding the suggested materials a condition is placed on the outline consent relating to materials to be agreed prior to the commencement of works on the station access.

We are of course continuing dialogue with the applicant over details of design, but again re-iterate our support in principle for the proposals. However the question of loss of car parking spaces for the station and their replication elsewhere needs addressing

Final Comments

Thank you for your letter of 02/02/2012 providing Network Rail with an opportunity to comment on the abovementioned application.

We note the comments made by I am afraid they do not overcome the plain fact that consent for the removal of the existing car park spaces is a matter for the Regulator, and it is unlikely that consent would be forthcoming without proper provision for their replacement, either at the same time or to an agreed and costed programme, neither of which is in place here. Although you may still technically grant consent for the works, it cannot be implemented with respect to the 70 spaces until the Regulatory issues are addressed. We must therefore maintain our stance that the scheme needs to address the re-provision of these displaced spaces and does not do so in its current form.

Property Development Manager

I have reviewed the costs, rates, yields and timescale used in the appraisal and would make the following comments:

The void periods for the retail units are probably low at 6 months' rent free. In some instances to get longer leases away 12 to 18 months rent free are being dictated by retailers with good covenant strength.

The yield used are realistic in the current climate as are the construction cost rates and timescale to bring forward the various elements.

I would have thought it likely that some of the contaminated land reclamation costs or bad ground provision should be made as well as provision for utility reinforcement works, particularly for electricity. Whilst reasonable costs may have been covered by the inclusion of contingency and municipal costs, in my experience all utility companies view such large scale developments as opportunities to bolster their business infrastructure. The appraisal may therefore be understated in this respect.

Representations as a Result of Publicity

The application has been advertised in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. 5 letters of objection have been received. A summary of the comments are listed below:

1. hotel would overlook cottages
2. loss of light
3. loss of privacy
4. noise and disturbance from both operation of uses and construction phase
5. operational plant and machinery (air con, extractors etc.)should not increase noise in area
6. only public transport, taxis and weight restricted vehicles should be allowed to use Station Road
7. access to the multi storey car park should be from Station Road East
8. night deliveries should be avoided
9. speed limit of 20 mph imposed
10. pedestrian crossing where the foot tunnel emerges should be improved
11. noise dust and fumes from demolition and construction will impact in amenity of residents
12. Increased vehicle movements would result in congestion, noise, fumes, and should be appropriately controlled including routing agreements prior to the commencement of works (a number of conditions have been suggested controlling such matters as hours of operation, equipment, wheel washing, no waste burning on site, and controlling noise, dust etc. via British Code of Practice.
13. there are already too many bedsits in the vicinity which cause big problems in relation to parking.
14. all the drains are blocked
15. children are playing in the streets as there are no green areas
16. overlooking
17. the area is already too heavily overbuilt and populated
18. existing access and parking to neighbouring properties should not be affected
-19. heights of buildings should be carefully considered to ensure they do not overpower adjacent properties
20. may result in overshadowing loss of daylight/sunlight to my garden/property
21. overlooking from the 3-4 storey properties
22. development is likely to result in antisocial behaviour and late night gathering in what is a quiet residential area
23. what would the leisure and community uses be? – (Officer comment – from the submitted information it is envisaged that these would be 'fitness suite/gym uses that can be found adjacent to railway stations throughout the country').
24. in order to be in keeping with the area it should be predominantly residential
25. large modern buildings will be out of character with the surrounding architecture
26. noise and disturbance from the construction phase and access to my property needs to be retained during this period.
27. little or no progress has been made in relation to the relocation of the business. As such the proposal would result in loss of employment and an adverse impact on local business
28. the economic viability of the development has not been demonstrated
29. many of the proposals could be achieved through a piecemeal approach without the need to compulsory purchase.
30. the height of the listed buildings particularly near to the cottages are out f keeping with the character and appearance of the area. A reduction in scale is required.
31. the incubator units are situated too close to the proposed residential housing and the structure is too imposing on the residential housing on Grantley Street.

32. viability is used as the justification for the height. But no viability assessment has been undertaken to justify this contention.
33. car parking is an issue that has not been properly addressed. The impact of the development will inevitably result in an increase in car parking demand. The current proposal replaces 70 convenient car parking spaces with 70 car parking spaces in an inferior location whilst taking no account of the increased demand. No account has been taken of the congestion issues imposed elsewhere in the town centre by the schemes proposals.

Officer Evaluation

The key issues for consideration are compliance with policy, residential amenity, highway safety/capacity, design and impact on townscape, impact on heritage assets and drainage.

Compliance with Policy

The outline application can be seen as a direct result of the plan-led approach to comprehensively developing a site from the adopted Core Strategy, emerging Grantham Area Action Plan and the site specific guidance contained in the adopted Development Brief for Station Approach.

As can be seen from the comments of the policy section the proposals are compliant with these documents. As such the proposal is considered acceptable from a policy perspective.

Residential Amenity

There have been a number of concerns raised in relation to the impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. These concerns relate to the noise and disturbance both during the construction phase and operational phase, overlooking loss of privacy and overshadowing/loss of daylight/sunlight.

It is considered that noise and disturbance can be satisfactorily controlled. Restricting hours of operation, delivery times, noise limits to any external ancillary equipment.

The amenity of the future occupiers can also be effectively protected by the appropriate sound insulation and mechanical ventilation.

It is accepted that the proposal will introduce built form closer to the existing properties. However, it is considered that the disposition and orientation of the buildings and separation distance to existing properties is sufficient to ensure that there would not be any significant overshadowing loss of daylight/sunlight that could justify a refusal of planning permission on these grounds.

The aforementioned property disposition and separation distances coupled with the careful sighting of windows at the detailed design stage when reserved matters are submitted would ensure there would not be significant overlooking and/or loss of privacy.

It is acknowledged that the outlook from the neighbouring dwellings would change as any views over the site would be removed. I accept that these changes may not be welcomed. But to ensure that the existing occupiers would experience no adverse impact from a new development would be an unreasonable level of test for a proposed development.

The noise and disturbance that neighbouring occupiers may experience from the existing uses must also be taken into consideration. The removal of what may termed bad neighbour uses from adjacent to a predominantly residential area weighs in favour of the proposal.

Highway Safety/Capacity

The applicants have provided an explanatory note to illustrate the reasoning and justification behind the parking strategy for the development:

“In undertaking this review, we have sought to answer queries both over whether will be enough spaces for the proposed development and that there will be sufficient to cater for existing demand generated by users of the railway station (i.e. demand for on-site spaces or demand for the station car parks).

Under-pinning philosophy

Throughout the development’s conception and design there has been a strong emphasis, supported by both Lincolnshire County Council and SKDC, on making the site sustainable; in transportation terms, the accessible location of the site (located close to Grantham’s town centre, residential urban core as well and the railway and bus stations) greatly assists with achieving this objective. Our approach on sustainable transport accords with the overall thrust of the Council’s maximum parking standards contained in LCC Development Guide 7, which includes the statements:

> "...in some locations (for example, in town centres of the larger urban areas) where there is easy access to public transport, good facilities for walking and cycling and existing public car parking facilities, then a lower provision may be appropriate" and
> "In general, there will be a presumption against parking dedicated to specific retail and service developments within city/town centres. Any parking that is permitted will normally be provided as short term parking for general public use to assist in maintaining the vitality and viability of those centres"

In line with this ethos, it is proposed that parking at the site (in both Phases 1 and 2) will be limited. As well as National, Regional and Local transport policy, this conforms with Development Guide 7, which states:

> “It is widely acknowledged that the availability of car parking has a significant influence on an individual’s decision on whether or not to drive to their destination, even for locations well served by public transport. Car parking standards for new developments are therefore an important tool in promoting sustainable travel and encouraging greater use of public transport, cycling and walking (and adhering to national, regional and local sustainable polices etc), this will restrict parking demand and therefore vehicle movements to the site.”

and furthermore goes on to state;

> “there may be other specific locations ... where the local authority wishes to encourage access to the development on foot, cycle or public transport. High levels of car parking provision would distract from this aim and hence a reduced level of parking may be sought. It is important, therefore, that prospective developers discuss their proposals at an early stage with the appropriate District Council and with the County Council.”

Later in this note, we set out the strategy for parking in the SKDC adopted Development Brief for Grantham Station Approach, which is the embodiment of the above policy at local level.

Information previously provided
The core document in relation to transport issues is the Transport Assessment (TA), which is a specific document submitted with the planning application, as required by SKDC’s validation checklist. In Chapter 2 of the TA, there is a clear commitment to adhere to policy, from

Government through regional, to a local level, to promote sustainable forms of transport. Reference is made to the Transport Strategy Grantham 2007 – 2021 which states that "any new development in this area should include consideration of access to the rail station for all modes of transport, the creation of good pedestrian links between the rail station and the town centre, and other measures to counteract the isolation of the rail station from the rest of the town." There is a clear appreciation that the Station Approach area is well suited to be served by public transport, including both bus and train.

Chapter 12 of the TA is devoted to the consideration of parking. The existing provision is set out clearly in Figure 12.1, which shows parking areas on a map and provides details of the number of spaces in each. The loss of parking, including that for rail users, through redevelopment of Site 1 is explained, and consideration of parking required in the future not only took account of known demand springing from future development, but also took account of the findings of a survey.

In Phase 2 of Site 1's development this parking will be built over. It has been assumed (based on liaison with the council) that Phase 2 will be opening in 2019. At this time, it is expected that the existing parking demand in the area (primarily, but not exclusively, this is for the railway station) will be accommodated within the existing capacity provided by other nearby station car parks

To confirm that there is sufficient capacity in these other car parks for the existing total parking demand, a survey was commissioned and analysis undertaken. Based on the survey data, is has been concluded that there will be sufficient capacity to accommodate parking demand when Site 1 Phase 2 opens.

When Site 2 is developed additional parking capacity is required, it is assumed this will be in the form of a 760 space multi-storey car park. This belief accords with the Development Brief for the area, as described below. There will not be any loss in parking provision for rail users, and may be an increase.

Further detail on the parking strategy adopted is set out in Appendix G to the TA. It sets out, for example, the value of adopting a phased approach to development for both Sites 1 and 2 over some 10 years, so that the loss of car parking during development of Phase 1 of Site 1 will not be too sharply felt. Indeed, during Phase 1a, no parking will be lost. To demonstrate our awareness of the need for sound phasing, we added some parking to our Phase 1a , so making good use of the otherwise vacant land in the short term (1-5 years) In addition, there is a sound appreciation of the means (a combination of "carrots" and "sticks" to ensure implementation of the parking strategy. The rationale of the strategy depends upon the consideration of Sites 1 and 2 together, and a recognition that provision in Site 2 of both a multi-storey car park and other surface car parks will adequately provide for future demand.

Planning policy

In addition to the policy references to parking in transport documents, it is important for SKDC to consider references to parking in its own adopted planning documents. These references have not been explicitly set out in the submitted documents, and they thus warrant further consideration here.

The Core Strategy for the District, adopted in 2010, is effectively silent on the issue of car parking provision. We are now aware that SKDC is seeking to prepare a strategy for parking within Grantham, but that is not far enough advanced to have informed the current proposals.

In the Town Centre Masterplan, dating from 2007, there is a clear statement concerning the adequacy of parking provision in the town centre:

> "There are five full time public parking areas within Grantham Town Centre which are spread throughout the town and are easily accessible to the main town centre retail areas along the High Street. In addition, there is a large car park of around 500 spaces associated with the Asda supermarket located in the North West corner of the town centre. Information from the ticket machines indicates that there is spare parking capacity within the town during the week; however, demand exceeds supply on Saturdays when the majority of the parking areas are full between 11am and 5 pm."

Such is the location and mix of uses proposed at the Station Approach site that it is unlikely that the proposals would make the lack of parking on Saturdays any worse.

Later in the Town Centre Masterplan, there should be the provision of acceptable levels of rail user car parking, but that issue is considered fully by the parking strategy behind our submission. Elsewhere in the Masterplan, there is general statement that the visual impact of car parking on the urban environment should be minimised. While some surface car parking will be retained during Phase 1a of our proposals, that position will be temporary only, so that neither the Masterplan nor the Development Brief, (see below) are jeopardised.

The Town Centre Masterplan set out the advantages of directing development in the Station Approach area, so the Development Brief for that area was produced for and adopted by the District Council.

The question of parking is taken seriously in the Development Brief. One of the key principles is "Minimising the visual impact of surface parking." Clearly, this is a principle we have taken seriously in evolving our overall development proposals. That principle sits adjacent to "Creating a public transport interchange with bus services extended to the rail station." Again, that principle is key to our proposals, which promote enhanced bus services to the railway station, thus encouraging travel by means other than by car.

Indeed, our ideas follow closely the "overarching principle" for the area, which seeks to "transform the existing under-utilised land of surface car parks and warehouses into a distinctive gateway to the town centre." If car parks were to become a significant component of land use within our proposals, we would not be according with an adopted policy document. That is why neither the Development Brief nor our proposals show surface parking as allocations within Site 1.

In describing the future development of Site 2, the Development Brief states the following:

> "A key aim for the redevelopment of Site 1 is to release the land currently occupied by surface car parking by providing a multi-storey car park capable of containing all the public parking provision for the Station and surrounding area (Figure 21). The proposed location for the multi-storey car park is in the north western area of Site 2, within close proximity of the station entrance, thus releasing land for re-development on Site 1."

The emphasis above is made by us. The wording makes clear that the new provision would cater not only for rail users but also for the needs of "the surrounding area" which would certainly include both Sites 1 and 2 within the Station Approach area. It is envisaged that work on Site 2, and including the provision of the multi-storey car park, will begin before development of Site 1 is completed.

The above text extract referred to public car parking, including that of employees on sites. However, it is accepted that there should "operational" car parking, for specific needs of the future occupants of both site 1 and Site 2. The Brief acknowledges that fact, and states

"The proposed development operational parking will be provided either in secure parking courtyards or undercroft car park for the offices."

That statement adheres to the principle of minimising the visual impact of parking. The layout proposals we have put forward allow for reasonable and limited operational parking, and for access to parking spaces. It will be for the reserved matters applications for the specific buildings or groups of buildings to provide details as to how the operational parking can be adequately provided. In doing so, they will need to take account of essential parking, and show maximum provision possible while adhering to the overall design philosophy. We would expect creative thought given to means of provision, such as the integration of garages within residential blocks. We would also expect, as set out in our Parking Strategy, that means of reducing the demand for private car use should be demonstrated through such means as travel plans. These should be produced by the developers of the individual plots within both Sites 1 and 2, to ensure their adherence to our sustainable approach not only to transport, but to the development proposals as a whole.

Summary
We consider that the overall and holistic provision for parking within both Sites 1 and 2 of the Station Approach area accords with both planning and transport policy from Government to local and, indeed, site specific level. Our design approach aligns with wider transport, environmental and social policy objectives, e.g. addressing congestion, reducing carbon and encouraging healthy / active travel. We are comforted by the fact that the SKDC Policy team has not criticised our overall approach to development, including parking.

The parking strategy we have set out in the planning application allows for the retention and creation of adequate car parking space in the area. Moreover, the phased approach to development will ensure that adequate provision will apply throughout the delivery programme of the Station Approach regeneration.

Accordingly, we believe there are no grounds related to parking that warrant this planning application being refused. Lincolnshire Highways Alliance is content to adhere to conditions conforming to tests of reasonableness applied to the outline consent to ensure the parking proposals are implemented appropriately.

The local highway authority has not objected to the proposed development, but has suggested a number of conditions. As such it is considered that the scheme is acceptable from a highway safety and capacity perspective. A reduced level of parking provision is an acknowledged methodology for sites in sustainable town centre locations and accords with current planning guidance promoting alternatives to the car.

Design/Impact on Townscape

Whilst this planning application is in outline form, there is significant discussion of design, appearance and materials in the submitted design and access statement. There is an acknowledgement of the need to make the development coherent in relation to the neighbouring properties, whilst avoiding a pastiche. These matters will form part of the reserved matters submissions pursuant to any grant of outline planning permission.

As part of the Environmental Impact Assessment townscape and visual impact have been assessed. Its conclusions are that the development will have a beneficial effect on the surrounding townscape. The impacts of the development being mitigated by the following:

"The principal form of mitigations lies mainly in the scheme's detailed design with the orientation of a tree lined avenue, courtyard and garden spaces providing a balance to a setting of the proposed

and existing buildings. The mass, scale and height of the development has been considered in the design process to allow for varying heights of buildings throughout the development. Two storey buildings are focused along the edge of existing residential properties to better fit with the townscape and the larger retail and office buildings have been positioned further within the site and towards Wharf Road to better integrate with the existing townscape".

It is considered that the scheme is an opportunity to provide a distinctive arrival point into Grantham and provide a strong connection and promote accessibility between the railway station and the town centre. This in conjunction with the removal of the unattractive existing industrial uses would significantly improve the character and appearance of the area.

This is summarised in the submitted design and access statement:

"Active frontages would surround a number of public places to promote activities, provide passive surveillance and enhance safety in the area. Contemporary architectural style would be used to create a high quality development that would reflect and be inspired by local character and materials. The variety and rhythm created would create an attractive and appealing public realm made up of a mixture to include landmark buildings. These would be located at key points throughout the site, such as along Wharf Road and within the centre of the development, to create a stronger sense of arrival as well as improving legibility, vistas and street enclosure".

Impact on Heritage Assets

The impact of the development in relation to heritage assets has been assessed. The comments of the conservation officer indicate that the proposal, subject to high quality materials and design, would actually improve the setting of the listed cottages fronting Station Approach.

In relation to the wider heritage impacts the Officer also states:

"The site currently comprises of a mix of industrial uses, open standing car parks and derelict land and forms a poor quality setting for the heritage assets. The proposal offers the opportunity to enhance the setting of these assets by providing a mix of high quality contemporary buildings and the potential positive townscape benefits are broadly welcomed.

The setting of the station would be enhanced by the provision of a new square and the relocation of car parking to the south of the site. The public realm works and proposed material palette for the main pedestrian links and spaces are of a high quality which will enhance the setting of the heritage assets and provide an attractive link to the town centre. The opportunity to open up a new vista to the Grade II Maltings on Wharf Road is also a positive feature of the scheme".

In light of these comments it is considered that the proposed development would improve the setting of the heritage assets which weigh in favour of the development.

Drainage

There are ongoing discussions between the applicants and the Environment Agency in relation to matters of flooding and drainage. Final comments from the Agency will be reported in the late items paper or verbally at committee.

Section 106 Heads of Terms

Draft Heads of Terms was submitted with the application. It states that, in line with policy SP4 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy Developer Contributions, Lincolnshire County Council, as

developer, agrees to discussions with South Kesteven District Council to draw up a legal agreement subject to a financial viability appraisal.

The proposed development is clearly part of the wider aspirations of Grantham as its promotion of growth point status.

The scheme is designed to achieve the following:

-Provide encouragement to private sector investment
-facilitate its own implementation of revised public transport, access and public realm;
-establish firm commitments to achieving high quality of design;
-encourage the future redevelopment of Site 2 and of Grantham Railway Station.

A development appraisal has been submitted which in summary, shows that the scheme is not considered financially viable based on current market conditions and it is the planning applicant's view that the scheme cannot support any s106 obligations that may have been requested.

“To illustrate this view, the appraisal indicates that for a developer to obtain a return on the cost of development of 15% (which is in itself rather low, the normal market assumption is for a 20% return), the land would need to be given to the developer at nil cost and the developer then given a further cash injection in order to proceed! Clearly this would not constitute a commercial transaction that would be undertaken by the private sector.

The delivery of the Station Approach scheme is therefore only considered deliverable following significant public sector investment in recognition of the fact that the scheme will bring a number of economic benefits to Grantham including new job creation, improved public realm and enhanced movement corridors between the existing town centre and railway station”.

It is clear from the submitted appraisal that the proposed development is not viable if Section 106 contributions are insisted upon. The development has significant wider regeneration and economic benefits for the town and help the town develop its vision to of becoming “...as a key economic centre not only in Lincolnshire but also sub-regionally” which are considered, in this particular case to warrant accepting no Section 106 contributions.

If Section 106 requirements are insisted upon the development would be unviable and the development would not take place.

Crime and Disorder

It is considered that the proposed development would not raise any significant crime and disorder implications.

Human Rights Implications

Article 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 would be breached.

SUMMARY OF REASON(S) FOR APPROVAL

The proposal is considered to be an acceptable form of development that would represent an important opportunity to regenerate the Station Approach area of Grantham and show commitment towards Grantham's Growth Point Status. The proposal is considered to accord with the thrust of national policy contained in PPS1 - Delivering Sustainable Development, PPS3 - Housing, PPS4 - Planning for the Sustainable Economic Growth, PPS5 - Planning and the Historic Environment, PPS9 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, PPG13 - Transport, PPG17 - Planning for Open space, Sport and Recreation, PPS23 - Planning and Pollution Control, PPG24 - Planning and Noise, PPS25 - Development and Flood Risk, Regional Guidance contained in Policy 1 - Regional Core Objectives, Policy 2 - Promoting Better Design, Policy 3 - Distribution of New Development, Policy 4 - Development in the Eastern Sub area, Policy 13a - Regional Housing provision, Policy 14 - Regional Priorities for affordable housing, Policy 18 - Regional Priorities for the economy, Policy 22 - Regional Priorities for Town Centres and Retail Development, Policy 26 - Protecting and Enhancing the Region's Natural and Cultural Heritage, Policy 27 - Regional Priorities for the Historic Environment, Policy 32 - A Regional Approach to Water Resources and Water Quality, Policy 35 - A Regional Approach to Managing Flood Risk, Policy 48 - Regional Car Parking Standards and local guidance contained in policies SP1 - Spatial Strategy, SP3 - Sustainable Integrated Transport, SP4 - Developer Contributions, EN1 - Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District, EN2 - Reducing the Risk of Flood Risk, EN4 - Sustainable Construction and Design, H1 - Residential Development, H3 - Affordable Housing, E1 - Employment Development, E2 - Town Centre and Retail Development, the Station Approach Development Brief - Adopted October 2010, and the emerging Grantham Area Action Plan.

Whilst concerns have been raised in relation to residential amenity, visual amenity, highway safety, traffic congestion, impact on the form and character of the area they are not considered to outweigh the policies referred to above or the wider regeneration benefits that are likely to result from the scheme.

RECOMMENDATION: That subject to the concerns of the Environment Agency being successfully addressed, the development be Approved subject to condition(s)

1. Applications for approval of reserved matters must be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matters to be approved.

   Reason – To comply with Section 92 (as amended if the Town and Country Planning Act)

2. Details of 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) Appearance
   b) Landscaping
   c) Layout

   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.

3. Notwithstanding the submitted details no development shall be commenced until full details of the proposed phasing programme including land areas, associated public realm works and parking as indicated on plan 1034919-OP-DWG-003 RevA, the broad location of associated off site highway works and timescales, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved phasing programme unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

   Reason - The applicants have indicated that the works necessary to implement the scheme fully are likely to come forward in a phased manner. To ensure that the highway network is not adversely affected by the development. To ensure that pedestrian routes through the development are made available at an appropriate time and to ensure adequate parking is available.

4. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

   10349919-OP-DWG-001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008.

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

5. Construction of any building or phase of development hereby approved shall not take place unless and until samples and specifications of all materials to be used on all external elevations of the development and surface treatments have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be constructed only using the approved materials unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

   Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

6. No part of each phase of the development hereby approved shall commence until details of the measures to be incorporated into the development (or phase thereof) to demonstrate how secure by design accreditation will be achieved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with these approved details. No part of each phase of the development hereby approved shall be occupied or used until the local planning authority has acknowledged in writing that it has received written confirmation of a secure by design accreditation.

   Reason - To reduce the risk of crime and to reflect the guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement 'Delivering Sustainable Development'.

7. All phases of the development hereby approved shall achieve a post-construction Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) rating of at least three star sustainability rating under the code for sustainable homes for those elements of the development, which are residential in nature. A post construction review certificate shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any of the buildings or phase of the development hereby approved are first occupied.

   Reason - In order to minimise the environmental impact of the development and the principles contained within Planning Policy Statement 1.

8. No part of each phase of the development hereby approved shall be occupied unless and until an acoustic attenuation scheme of the acoustic glazing and acoustically treated ventilation to be installed as part of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full before use of each of the phases of the residential development first commences.

   Reason - To protect the amenity of the occupants of the premises once the development hereby approved is occupied.

9. No part of each phase of the development hereby approved shall be first occupied until the buildings, together with any externally mounted ancillary equipment, are acoustically insulated in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in order to secure a reduction in the level of noise emanating from the equipment. Any externally mounted ancillary plant, equipment and servicing shall be acoustically treated in accordance with a scheme designed so as to achieve a noise level of 5dB below the existing background (LA90) in each octave band at the nearest noise sensitive location.

   Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation

10. No phase of the development approved by this permission shall be commenced until details of the existing and proposed floor levels have been submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

    Reason - To ensure that the development is subject to minimum risk of flooding, pursuant to Planning Policy Statement 25 Planning and Flooding.

11. No part of each phase of the development hereby permitted shall commence until fully detailed cross section plans of the existing and proposed external ground levels of that phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority.

    Reason - To ensure that a satisfactory development.

12. No phase of development shall commence until a hard and soft landscaping treatment scheme together with long term maintenance arrangements has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented not later than 12 months from the date the buildings are first occupied. If within a period of 5 years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes, in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless otherwise agree in writing by the local planning authority.

    Reason - To ensure that a satisfactory landscaping scheme for the development is carried out that respects the character and visual amenities of the area.

13. In this condition 'retained tree' means an existing tree, shrub or hedge which is to be as shown as retained on the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard BS3998 Tree Work Recommendations 2010.

(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.

(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.

Reason - In order avoid damage to trees/shrubs adjacent to and within the site which are of important amenity value to the area and in order to protect the character of the area.

14. All tree work carried out during the construction of the development hereby approved should be carried out in accordance with British Standard BS 3998 'Tree Work Recommendations 2010'.

    Reason - In order avoid damage to trees/shrubs adjacent to and within the site which are of important amenity value to the area.

15. Prior to the commencement of each phase of the development hereby approved, a Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This should include correctly calculated construction exclusion zones, proposals for protection barriers and ground protection measures, engineering construction details where foundations, driveways and paving fall within the root protection areas of the retained trees, and details of any necessary tree surgery to facilitate construction operations. The development shall then be constructed in full accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

    Reason - In order avoid damage to trees/shrubs adjacent to and within the site which are of important amenity value to the area.

16. No trees shall be felled, or have any works undertaken on them, during the bird nesting season (March to August inclusive), unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

    Reason - To ensure the protection of wildlife habitats in the locality.

17. No phase of development approved by this permission shall commence until the existing buildings and trees have been surveyed for evidence of use by bats prior to demolition, and the results of this survey shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. If bats are found to inhabit these buildings or trees, no development shall commence until a scheme for the conservation of this species has been agreed with the Local Planning Authority. The phase of development shall be implemented in accordance with the details so approved.

Reason - To protect bats and their roost sites.

18. 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.

    Reason: In order to provide a reasonable opportunity to record the history of the site.

19. The applicant will provide proposals for the presentation and interpretation of key heritage features as amenities within the public space, and this will form part of the landscaping works at a later stage of the development. The scheme to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and implemented on site in accordance with the approved scheme.

    Reason - To commemorate the history of the site by means of suitable presentation and an interpretation board.

20. All vehicles entering and leaving the site during the construction period are to pass through a wheel wash. Details of the wheel wash shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the development of each phase commencing. The wheel wash shall be retained on site during the construction period, and shall be positioned to allow use throughout each phase of construction; the locations of the wheel wash shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to being implemented.

    Reason - To ensure that the proposed development does not cause unacceptable amounts of dust in the vicinity and to ensure that local roads are kept clear of mud.

21. All contractors' vehicles entering and leaving the site during the construction period shall be sheeted.

    Reason - To ensure that the proposed development is not prejudicial or a nuisance to the adjacent premises in the interests of public health and amenity.

22. No phase of development shall commence until a scheme for the storage and segregation of waste and for the provision of recycling facilities within that phase has been approved in writing by the Local planning authority

    Reason - In the interests of amenity and public health and to ensure a satisfactory form of development.

23. Deliveries, servicing and collections, including waste collections shall not take place outside the following hours: 07:30 to 18:00 Monday to Saturday 8:00 to 16:00 Sunday/Bank Holidays.

    Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby noise sensitive properties.

24. The hours of work for noisy work on site shall be restricted to 07:30 -18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 – 13:00 on Saturday and no noisy work on Sunday and Bank Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

    Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

25. Before development commences a scheme for the extraction of any fumes, vapours and odours from the premises hereby approved shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to occupancy and shall remain operational thereafter.

    Reason - In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers nearby properties.

26. The residential units hereby approved shall be used only as private dwellings (which description shall not include serviced apartments/apart hotels or similar uses where sleeping accommodation (with or without other services) is provided by way of trade for money or money's worth and occupied by the same person for less than ninety consecutive nights) and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1995, or any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

    Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the neighborhood by ensuring that other uses which could cause a loss of amenity such as serviced apartments/apart hotels do not commence without prior approval and to ensure the permanent retention of the accommodation for normal residential purposes

27. The development, or phases of the development, hereby approved shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the parameters identified in the drawing title Proposed Building Heights Plan' drawing numbered 1034919-OP-DWG-007 (stamped as received by the Local Planning Authority on 14th October 2011). For the avoidance of doubt the height of the buildings and distribution of uses shall not deviate from the parameters set out in the above drawing and statement.

    Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development.

28. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or brought into use until a verification report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall be submitted by the agreed competent person and identify that approved remedial works have been implemented. The report shall include, unless agreed in writing:
    (a) A complete record of remediation activities, and data collected as identified in the remediation scheme, to support compliance with agreed remediation objectives;
    (b) As built drawings of the implemented scheme;
    (c) Photographs of the remediation works in progress; and
    (d) Certificates demonstrating that imported and/or material left in situ is free from contamination.
    Thereafter the scheme shall be monitored and maintained in accordance with the approved remediation scheme.

    Reason: Previous activities associated with this site may have caused, or had the potential to cause, land contamination and to ensure that the proposed site investigations and remediation will not cause pollution in the interests of the amenities of the future residents and users of the development; and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010) and national guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement PPS23 (Planning & Pollution Control).

29. The development shall not commence until a working plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailing the measures that will be taken

to minimise dust, emissions from vehicles and plant, noise and vibration arising from the development process.

The term 'development process' includes demolition of buildings and structures, groundworks and any other works necessary to complete the development.

Reason: In the interests of protecting surrounding amenity.

30. Other than as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of each phase excluding demolition and works relating to the temporary car park, full details of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and development shall only proceed in accordance with the said agreed details:-
    (a) details of CCTV coverage of the scheme.
    (b) details of the cycle parking stands.
    (c) details of all street furniture to be provided including bins, lighting/CCTV columns, seats directional signs etc.
    (d) details of the means to control access to and egress from the car park.

    Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the details of the scheme are acceptable.

31. The access to the development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the indicative plans referenced 1034919-0P-DWG-004/A; 005/A and 006/A dated 25 October 2011 and to a phasing arrangement agreed in writing by the local planning authority

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

32. Before development commences on site further details relating to the vehicular access to the public highway, including materials, specification of works and construction method shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The approved details shall be implemented on site before the development is first brought in to use and thereafter retained at all times.

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

33. Within seven days of any new access being brought into use, all existing vehicular access points serving this development or phase of development shall be re-assessed and if any are considered as being redundant these access crossings shall be permanently closed off.

    Reason: To reduce to a minimum the number of individual access points to Station Road, Grantley Street, Queen Street or Wharf Road in the interests of road safety.

34. When the application is made for approval of the 'Reserved Matters' that application shall show details of the arrangements for the parking/turning/manoeuvring/loading/unloading of vehicles within the site. These arrangements shall be provided before the building(s) is/are occupied and shall be kept permanently free for such use at all times thereafter.

    Reason: To enable calling vehicles to wait clear of the carriageway of Station Road, Queen Street. and Grantley Street and to allow vehicles to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety.

35. No part of the Site 1 Initial Phase of the development shall be commenced (apart from those works indicatively identified on drawing numbers 1034919-0P-DWG-004/A and Figure A - 'Site 1 Phase 1 -Access Improvements and On-Site Loading' within the Transport Assessment or as specified) before the works to improve the public highway by means of the reconfiguration of the junction Wharf Road/Grantley Street, widening Grantley Street and realignment of footway(s) and cycleway improvements together with all ancillary works have been certified complete by the local planning authority.

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

36. No development shall be commenced to Site 1 Phase 2 (apart from those works indicatively identified on drawing number 1034919-0P-DWG-006/A or as specified) before the works to improve the public highway (by means of realignment and widening of Queen Street together with all ancillary works) have been certified complete by the local planning authority.

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

37. No 'development shall be commenced to Site 1, Phase 2- drawing number 1034919-0P-DWG-002/A until a comprehensive scheme for highway improvements to Station Road from its junction with Wharf Road/Harlaxton Road up to and including its connection with Station Road East) have been certified complete by the local planning authority.

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

38. No development shall be commenced to Site 1, Phase 2 drawing number 1034919-0P-DWG-002A before the works to improve the public highway by means of until a comprehensive scheme for the signalised junction improvements to Station Road East/London Road has been submitted to, approved, constructed and) have been certified complete by the local planning authority.

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

39. Where roads and footways are to become the responsibility of the local highway authority - before each dwelling (or other development as specified) is occupied the roads and/or footways providing access to those dwellings or units and, for the whole of its frontage, from an existing public highway, shall be constructed to a specification to enable them to be adopted as Highways Maintainable at the Public Expense, less the carriageway and footway surface courses.

    The carriageway and footway surface courses shall be completed within three months from the date upon which the erection is commenced of the penultimate dwelling (or other development as specified).

    Reason: To ensure safe access to the site and each dwelling/building in the interests of residential amenity, convenience and safety.

40. 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, amenity and commerce of the residents of this site.

41. Before any dwelling is commenced, all of that part of the estate road and associated footways that forms the junction with the main road and which will be constructed within the limits of the existing highway, shall be laid out and constructed to finished surface levels in accordance with details to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority.

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

42. Within 6 months of the development being occupied, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter annually a staff survey shall be analysed and submitted to the local planning authority that will provide details of the implementation of the Travel Plan. The occupier shall ensure that travel arrangements are fulfilled in accordance with the Travel Plan, unless the local planning authority stipulates approval to any variation.

    Reason: In order that the local planning authority conforms to the requirements of PPG13 Transport, a Travel Plan has been conditioned to ensure that access to the site is sustainable and reduces dependency on the car.

43. Prior to the occupation of the development details of how parking will be restricted and altering of the direction of traffic flows shall be implemented in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

    Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic.

* * * * *

PWM1 **S11/1922/FULL** Target Decision Date: 04-Nov-2011

Applicant	**Mr Dick Baines** Lodge Farm, Main Street, Carlton Scroop, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 3AU
Agent	Mr Conor McAllister, Entrust Professional Services Ltd Daresbury Innovation Centre, Keckwick Lane, Daresbury, Warrington, Cheshire, WA4 4FS
Proposal	**Two wind turbines (hub height 29.6m, rotor diameter 20m and total ground to tip height 39.6m) and associated works**
Location	**Lodge Farm, Main Street, Carlton Scroop, Grantham, NG32 3AU**
App Type	Full Planning Permission
Parish(es)	Carlton Scroop

REPORT

Application Category

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

Reason for Referral to Committee

This application has been referred to the committee at the request of the local ward Member, as it is considered to be locally controversial. There is also significant local opposition to the proposal.

The Proposal

The proposal is for two small scale wind turbines with a hub height of 29.6m, rotor diameter of 20m and an overall height to blade tip of 39.6m. There would be a separation distance of 100m between the turbines.

The access track shown on the plan shows the route that would be taken by vehicles during construction and maintenance and would not involve construction of a hard surface.

The route taken for any cabling to connect to the grid and any ancillary buildings are not included in the plans. It is assumed that underground cabling would go directly to the applicant's farmstead across land in the applicant's ownership. A separate planning application may be necessary for any such works which are deemed to be development requiring planning permission.

The application site and its surroundings

The site is in open countryside located approximately 1.2km to the northwest of Carlton Scroop village. The turbines would be located within arable farmland on the gently undulating top of a plateau (approx 74m AOD) which forms part of a secondary escarpment to the higher ground of the Lincolnshire Edge escarpment to the east. Immediately adjacent to the site is a small area of uncultivated land where a former ironstone working has been filled in. The plateau slopes gently down towards the vale to the east and more abruptly down to the low lying Vale of Belvoir to the north and west and the vale containing the Honington Brook which forms part of the Ancaster Gap to the south. The nearest dwellings include a small cluster of dwellings approximately 550m to the east and two isolated farms between 550m and 700m to the west and south west.

Site History

A formal request for a screening opinion was submitted in May 2011 (S11/1468/EIASO) to determine whether the proposed turbines would fall into the category of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development. By virtue of the relatively small scale, it was determined that it was not EIA development. The screening opinion request proposed to locate the turbines approximately 400m to the east of the current application site.

The current application involves the same number of turbines of the same type and height but in a different location. Although some 400m to the east, it is considered that the context is not significantly different in terms of landscape sensitivity, distance from buildings, landscape features, ecology and heritage assets etc and therefore that an EIA is not considered necessary or appropriate.

An objector has made a direct request to the Secretary of State to make a screening opinion direction under regulation 6(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. The Secretary of State has confirmed that the proposal is not EIA Development.

An EIA would only be reasonably necessary in the case of large scale or particularly complex schemes which are likely to have significant and wide ranging environmental impacts, for example a nuclear power station, chemical works or major infrastructure project. In the case of wind energy developments, government guidance indicates that EIA is only likely to be applicable to large scale wind farms of more than five turbines and > 5MW output.

For the avoidance of doubt it should be noted that a screening opinion is a technical exercise to determine whether the development falls under a particular category of planning application (EIA Development) – it has no bearing on the acceptability or otherwise of a proposal. Furthermore, if it is deemed that a proposal is not EIA development, this does not override the need for the applicant to submit sufficient information with a planning application to enable the local planning authority to fully assess all the environmental impacts of the proposal.

Representations Received

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

The Highways Authority: No objection subject to delivery being carried out in accordance with the submitted Traffic Management Statement. The Highways Authority considers that the proposed development will not be detrimental to highway safety and traffic capacity.

Natural England: Refers to standing advice. However a request has been made for specific comments on the Ecological Survey. Any comments received will be reported in the late background papers

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust: LWT are satisfied that that no specific bat surveys are required as the turbines would be more than 50m from any features which could be used by commuting or foraging bats (hedgerows in this case). LWT are also satisfied, having assessed the ecology report and examined their own records, that there should not be any significant negative impacts on protected or notable species but suggest a post-construction monitoring condition for bird and bat mortality.

RSPB: No comments received

English Heritage: The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

National Trust: Following the submission of extra information (Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment), the National Trust have stated that they do not object. They consider that the overall impact on the setting of Belton house and associated park and structures would be “slight” and that the renewable energy benefits outweigh the heritage impact.

CPRE: No objection to this proposal but they wish to ensure that there should not be a future proliferation of turbines in this area and that turbines are removed when their active life is over.

SKDC Principal Conservation Officer: Generally concurs with the submitted Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment and concludes that whilst there will inevitably be some impact on the setting of the heritage assets in the area, that impact will not in his opinion be sufficiently detrimental to the setting and significance of these assets to warrant refusal on the grounds that the historic environment will be unduly compromised by the proposed development. Also suggests a condition for site restoration following decommissioning.

MOD: No objection, subject to the developer notifying them of the height of any construction equipment etc before and after completion so the turbines can be plotted on flying charts and aircraft can avoid the area.

NATS: No objection

SKDC Environmental Protection: Although the noise calculations are not measured on site but are based on an average of rural sites, they appear to be comparable with what would be expected in this area. The proposal would comply with the ETSU-R-97 limits, but a condition restricting decibel levels may be prudent.

Environment Agency: No objection

Carlton Scroop & Normanton Parish Council (Comments Summarised): Object to the application as it has not had a screening opinion; concerns about the quality of the information submitted with the application; impact on heritage assets, the surrounding landscape, wildlife and biodiversity, noise and disturbance, and a number of other miscellaneous issues.

Hough on the Hill Parish Council (Comments Summarised): Object to the application on the grounds of visual impact particularly on Hough on the Hill including heritage assets within the village; concerns about the quality of the information submitted with the application; impact on wildlife and biodiversity, from noise and disturbance, air safety, cumulative impact, access, and a number of other miscellaneous issues.

Hougham Parish Council: No specific objection raised, but various inaccuracies in the submitted information pointed out.

Ancaster Parish Council (Comments summarised): Object to the application on the grounds of visual impact; concerns about the quality of the information submitted with the application; impact on wildlife and biodiversity, from noise and disturbance, air safety, unproven benefits of wind energy, and a number of other miscellaneous issues.

Caythorpe Parish Council: The proposal does not materially affect the parish, but the parish council wish to be consulted if and when SKDC decides upon a policy on wind turbines.

Honington Parish Council: No observations

Barkston & Syston Parish Council (Comments Summarised): Object on the grounds of visual impact; impact on wildlife and biodiversity, it would set a precedent, and a number of other miscellaneous issues.

Representations as a result of publicity

The application has been advertised in accordance with the statement of community involvement relevant to this type of planning application. At the time of writing, 56 letters of objection had been received including some letters signed by several people. Multiple letters have been received from some objectors which have been counted as a single objection. Representations have also been received by a local opposition group called "Carlton Scroop & Normanton Action on Wind Turbines"

A summary of the main concerns are listed below and have been grouped under various headings:

Landscape and Visual Impact

- Visual intrusion
- Would spoil the beauty and character of the area
- Inappropriate in an area of outstanding natural beauty
- They would be ugly and would destroy the scenery
- They would be on green belt land
- Cumulative impact
- Impact on golf course
- Turbines should be in industrial/urban areas
- The colour would not blend in
- Good farm land would be wasted
- Would set a precedent allowing the whole area to be covered with turbines

Ecology

- Impact on bats
- Impact on birds
- A full ecological survey is needed

Amenity

- Noise/disturbance
- Shadow flicker
- Strobe effect of lights
- Peace and tranquillity of area would be destroyed
- Interrupted sleep
- Too close to homes
- TV & radio reception will be affected
- Annoyance to walkers
- Health impact

Safety

- Ice throw
- Blade failure
- Distraction to drivers
- Danger to horses and horse riders
- Could collapse in high winds

Heritage

- Impact on Belton House
- Impact on nearby conservation area, churches and listed buildings
- Archaeological survey not done

Applicant's Submission
- Plans and documents inaccurate and misleading
- Photomontages misleading
- Lack of information
- An EIA is necessary

Other
- Contrary to policy
- Concerns over access to site
- Aviation and air safety
- How would power get to applicant
- Will put of tourists
- Will drive residents away
- Not in public interest

Concerns which are not material planning considerations
- Loss of unspoilt view from properties
- Devaluation of property
- Only the applicant will benefit
- There are other sites on applicant's farm that would be better
- Wind power is inefficient
- National Policy should be changed
- The applicant has not consulted residents
- The applicant cannot see turbines from his property
- Greed of applicant
- Applicant should consider other forms of renewable energy

Policy Considerations

National Policy

Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1): Sustainable Development
Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 - Planning and Climate Change
Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5): Historic Environment
Planning Policy Statement 7 (PPS7): Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS9): Biodiversity and Geological conservation
Planning Policy Statement 22 (PPS22): Renewable Energy
Planning Policy Guidance 24 (PPG24): Planning and Noise

East Midlands Regional plan (RSS8)

Policy 1: Regional Core Objectives
Policy 26: Protecting and Enhancing the Region's Natural and Cultural Heritage
Policy 27: Regional Priorities for the Historic Environment
Policy 31: Priorities for Management and Enhancement of the Region's Landscape
Policy 40: Regional Priorities for Low Carbon Energy Generation

South Kesteven Core Strategy

Policy SP1: Spatial Strategy
Policy EN1: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District
Policy EN3: Renewable Energy

Other Relevant Documents

Belton Setting Study 2010
South Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment (January 2007)

Officer Evaluation

Key Issues

All new wind turbines by their nature will have an impact on their surroundings which will be harmful to some degree. However, there is a general presumption in current policy in favour of renewable energy proposals unless it can be demonstrated that substantial unacceptable visual or other environmental harm would result. On that basis, members should be aware that significant weight must be given to the wider benefits of renewable energy when assessing the potential environmental impact.

Taking the above into account, the key issues that need to considered are:

- Wider Benefits of Renewable Energy
- Landscape and Visual Impact (including cumulative impact)
- Impact on the Setting of Heritage Assets
- Noise, Disturbance and Amenity Issues
- Impact on Wildlife and Biodiversity

Quality and Accuracy of Submitted Information

Concern has been raised by a number of objectors including various parish councils about the quality and level of information submitted by the applicant including a number of minor inaccuracies in the supporting documents. Whilst it is acknowledged that there are some contradictory statements and inaccuracies in the supporting documents and that the photomontages are not all of the highest quality, it is considered that sufficient information has been submitted to enable officers and consultees to fully assess the impacts of the proposal and reach a reasoned judgement. Furthermore, the recently installed much larger wind turbine at Nearby Frinkley Farm gives a good indication of the likely visual impact.

Wider Benefits of Renewable Energy

National planning policy given in PPS22 (Renewable Energy) and The Supplement to PPS1 (Planning and Climate Change) promotes the development of renewable energy resources and stresses the need to reduce carbon dioxide emissions which are considered to be contributing to climate change. It also states that the wider social and economic benefits should be given significant weight when determining planning applications.

The East Midlands Regional Plan (RSS8) states that consideration should be given to the contribution of wind generation projects to regional renewable targets and national and international objectives on climate change. The South Kesteven Core Strategy (policy EN3) is generally

supportive of renewable energy schemes as long as they accord with other core strategy policies which in this case will mean policy EN1 relating to the impact on the surrounding environment.

The applicant would benefit from reduced energy costs, but the proposal would also have wider positive benefits by contributing to a reduction in demand for energy that would otherwise be produced from fossil fuel sources. Although it may be a relatively modest contribution, crucially, PPS22 is supportive of small scale schemes, stating that they should not be refused because their level of output is small.

Landscape and Visual Impact

The general thrust of policy (including PPS1, PPS7, RSS8 policy 1 and Core Strategy policy SP1 is to restrict development in the open countryside. However there are some exceptions to this general rule including rural diversification projects and development which requires a location away from built up areas. Wind turbines are one type of development that require such a location.

Wind turbines are tall structures which by their nature, stand out to some degree and cannot be easily hidden or disguised in any landscape. The key issue here is not whether they would be visible, but whether the landscape could absorb them without its overall character being harmed to such a degree as to warrant refusal.

Core Strategy policy EN1 requires development to be assessed against a number of criteria using The South Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). The LCA divides the district into areas with a distinctive landscape character. The site lies within “The Trent and Belvoir Vales” character area, although it is on a plateau of approximately 2km x 4km, adjacent to the Vale, rather than on the floor of the Vale itself. The site is also close to the “Southern Lincolnshire Edge” character area to the east and will to some extent have an impact on it. The “Grantham Scarps and Valleys” character area is some 3km to the south and would be affected to a lesser extent. The LCA states that the Trent and Belvoir Vales is likely to have “medium” sensitivity to wind energy proposals whilst the Grantham Scarps and Valleys and Southern Lincolnshire edge are described respectively as being of high and medium sensitivity. To some degree the boundaries of these character areas are flexible, with areas of overlap and should not be interpreted too rigidly.

The landscape around the application site in which the turbines would be visible has its own unique characteristics, as well as features in common with all these areas, and can be separated into two distinct elements – The immediate landscape and the vales and scarps beyond.

The turbines would be sited on elevated land of approx 75m AOD which takes the form of a plateau which slopes gently down towards the east. This area has more in common with the Southern Lincolnshire Edge character area with long uninterrupted views and wide horizons. The immediate surroundings consist of open and gently undulating countryside with few landscape features of intrinsic sensitivity and little settlement. Concern has been raised that the turbines would ruin unspoilt countryside, although in this immediate area, it is mostly intensively farmed arable land with large fields, many having had the hedgerow boundaries removed. The land is also scarred from filled in ironstone workings. Within this plateau zone, when viewed from the south and east, the turbines would mostly appear as isolated features within a wide and fairly featureless landscape of arable farmland dotted with trees and small woodlands. When viewed from the west and north however, this landscape is framed by the higher ground of the Lincolnshire Edge escarpment and the turbines would be seen against this backdrop.

The wider landscape beyond the plateau top is more complex and has a more dramatic topography with its mixture of scarps and vales and is considered to be of higher landscape value although it is not a statutorily designated area and therefore not deemed to be of the highest quality. It is also not

entirely unspoilt with the Carlton Scroop telecoms transmitter being a well established feature which to some extent dominates the area.

Beyond the immediate plateau, the turbines would be visible only from longer range vantage points, particularly the vales to the east and south forming the “Ancaster Gap” and the scarp of the “cliff” beyond Carlton Scroop and Normanton on Cliff. The varied nature of the landscape means that the visual impact would not be the same from all angles although the distances involved means that the turbines would be relatively low key features in the landscape as a whole.

From certain angles, (as can be seen on the ZVI), the turbines would be wholly or partially obscured by woodland or the local topography. This would include part of Carlton Scroop village and the low lying land to the immediate northwest, west and south of the plateau. From some vantage points such as the land to the west towards Gelston and Hough on the Hill, and from the top of the “cliff” to the east of Carlton Scroop, they would be seen partially against the backdrop of the higher ground in the distance.

From all other vantage points, they would be visible wholly or partially on the horizon and as with all wind turbines, would have a negative impact on the landscape to some degree. However, taking into account the relatively small scale of the turbines, the separation distance from these vantage points as well as other landscape features on the horizon (woodlands, trees, buildings etc), it is considered that they would not be unduly prominent and that the wider landscape is capable of absorbing them without the overall character of the landscape being undermined to such an extent that it would outweigh the positive benefits.

Cumulative Impact

PSS22 states that the cumulative impact of wind energy developments in the area should be taken into account. For the avoidance of doubt, this includes all existing turbines, consented turbines or planning applications for turbines currently under consideration. It does not include previous screening opinions or future schemes for which planning permission has not yet been sought.

In this case the only other relevant wind turbine scheme in the area is at Frinkley Farm. This is a single turbine of hub height 50m, blade diameter 33.4m and total ground to tip height 66.7m, approved by committee in March 2011 (S10/1759). It has been recently erected and is approximately 2.6km to the south west of the site. The much larger Carlton Scroop telecoms transmitter on Heath Lane has also been taken into account. There is a current planning application under consideration (S11/2713) at Allington, for a single wind turbine of similar dimensions to the current scheme although this is considered to be sufficiently distant (approximately 8.5km) to have no cumulative impact.

The Frinkley Farm turbine is significantly larger than the two proposed at Carlton Scroop and is not easily visible from Carlton Scroop itself and the areas to the north and east of the application site. Where it can be seen from this area, whilst it would be possible in some locations to see it and the proposed turbines in the same view, it has the appearance of a very distant and low key feature on the horizon. The cumulative impact from this angle is therefore considered to be low. Views looking northwards from the vale to the south of the site, including from the A607 are those most likely to be affected by the cumulative impact, where all three turbines as well as the Carlton Scroop telecoms transmitter would be partially visible on the horizon. Looking southwards from Caythorpe, the proposed turbines and the telecoms transmitter would also be visible together. However, these features would be well separated and would not clutter the horizon which is already broken by woodlands. Taking into account the relatively small scale of the proposed turbines in relation to the landscape and the other features, as well as the significant separation distance (Frinkley Farm 2.6km and telecoms transmitter 2km), it is not considered that the overall character of the

landscape would be undermined from the cumulative impact, to such an extent that it would outweigh the positive benefits.

Concern has been raised that if this application is approved it will set a precedent and pave the way for the area to be inundated with further wind turbines at some future date. Any future planning applications for wind turbines in this area would be assessed on their own individual merits including the cumulative impact. It is doubtful whether the immediate area could accommodate a large number of wind turbines of any scale without the cumulative impact having a substantial harmful visual impact which would outweigh the positive benefits.

Visual Amenity of Nearest Receptors

There is no statutory minimum distance that turbines have to be sited from dwellings so each case has to be assessed according to its individual circumstances. The closest properties to the site are three isolated dwellings - one at Howdale Farm (550m) and two at Bleak Farm (650m), and a small cluster of dwellings beyond the built up area of Carlton Scroop village including Highfield Farm (520m), Stone Horse Farm (580m) and Carlton Scroop Hall (560m). It is clear that the turbines would be significant landscape features when viewed from these distances and would impact to some degree on the outlook from some of these dwellings and their domestic curtilages. However, the cluster of dwellings to the east is well screened from the site by a belt of mature trees and none of the dwellings are directly oriented towards the site. It is considered that the relatively small scale of the turbines combined with the separation distances and individual circumstance of each dwelling ensures that they would not result in an unacceptable dominance of outlook or undermine the living conditions of the occupants from visual harm.

The Viking Way restricted byway passes some 340m to the south of the site. Concern has been raised that the turbine would be an unacceptable visual intrusion to recreational users of this route. As with the nearest dwellings, when viewed from the stretch of the Viking Way the turbines would be significant structures. However, to some extent, whether wind turbines are considered ugly or graceful features in the landscape is a subjective aesthetic judgment which divides opinion. The Viking Way is a long distance path and there are wide ranging views from it in this area and the sight of the turbines would be only a small part of the overall experience of using the path. It is therefore considered that the turbines would not significantly detrimentally affect or dominate users' experience of the path.

Furthermore, wind turbines, whether large or small scale, are by their nature slimline structures which do not block out the sunlight to any great degree or cast shadows over large areas and apart from the immediate area at the base, and are unlikely to result in a dominant and oppressive environment. Taking the above into account it is not considered that the turbines would cause unacceptable harm to the visual amenity of the occupiers of the nearest properties or users of The Viking Way.

Impact on the Setting of Heritage Assets

The proposed turbines would be located in an area where a number of heritage assets would be affected, including the nationally important grade I listed Belton House and grade I listed Belton Park and Gardens.

The Belton House and Park Setting Study is an adopted LDF background evidence document which classifies the sensitivity of the setting of Belton House and Park to various types of development including wind turbines, including development within views from various locations including Bellmount Tower and the roof of Belton House. The setting is divided into 5 elements. Element 5 of the setting of Belton House as defined in the study includes "all areas beyond the ridge lines and tree screens that contain the significant views". This zone is described as being

“exceptionally sensitive to tall structures which rise above the ridge or tree line”. Although the study gives 3km and 5km buffer zones, there is no clear cut off point where this zone ends as tall structures beyond these points can still have an impact, but the sensitivity of this zone to wind turbines gradually diminishes with distance from Belton to the point where there is no sensitivity. It would also depend on the scale of the development.

At 6 – 6.5km to the north of Belton, the turbines would be well beyond the zone of highest sensitivity. The wireframe diagrams and photomontages show that the turbines, would be partially visible from the roof of Belton House and from Bellmount Tower, but by virtue of their small scale and the considerable separation distance as well as trees/woodlands on the horizon would largely blend in with the background. The owners of Belton House and Park, The National Trust, consider that the impact on the setting of Belton House and Park would be “slight” and would not outweigh the wider benefits of renewable energy. For the above reasons, the impact on the setting of Belton House and Park, including the cumulative impact (the much larger Frinkley Farm turbine can also be seen from Belton) is not considered to be sufficient to warrant refusal. Some concern has been raised by objectors questioning the accuracy of these photos/diagrams, and in particular the relationship to Barkston church, but officers and consultees are satisfied that they are reasonably accurate.

There are a number of other heritage assets in the area, the settings of which would be affected by the proposal. These include St Nicholas Church, Normanton (Grade II* listed), St Nicholas Church, Carlton Scroop (Grade I listed), All Saints Church, Hough on the Hill (Grade I listed) as well as Hough on the Hill conservation area. Any other heritage assets within or beyond the nearest villages are considered to be either too small, out of view or too far away to be significantly affected by the turbines.

There is no statutory definition of the extent of a heritage asset’s setting. This will depend on the type and scale of the asset as well as the context. In respect of the listed churches, the setting can be reasonably described as their churchyards and their immediate village context. The turbines would be visible to some extent within the settings of these buildings and from some viewpoints the churches and turbines would be visible together. However, the impact is softened by the mature trees which surround the churchyards of all of these churches and limited by the small scale of the turbines and the separation distances (approximately 1.2 -1.6km). In respect of the setting of Hough on the Hill Conservation area, although there may be some views into and out of the conservation area where the turbines can be seen, again the small scale and separation distance limits the impact. Furthermore the main focus of the conservation area is the historic core of the village, which itself has been largely surrounded by more modern development.

A further factor which should be taken into account is the temporary nature of wind turbines (generally around 20 - 25 years) and their relatively short lifespan in relation to that of heritage assets.

Concern has been raised about the potential impact on archaeology. The Community Archaeologist has been consulted and is satisfied that the proposal would not affect any known sites of archaeological interest and that no archaeological intervention is necessary.

Taking the above into account, it is considered that although the turbines would inevitably result in some limited degree of harm to the setting of a number of heritage assets, it would not be significant enough to outweigh the wider public benefits.

Noise, Disturbance and Amenity Issues

The closest properties to the site are at Howdale Farm (550m), Bleak House (650m), Highfield Farm (520m), Stone Horse Farm (580m) and Carlton Scroop Hall (560m). These properties are those most likely to be affected by these issues.

National planning policy in PPS22 is very clear that noise from wind energy development should be assessed using a 1997 report prepared for The Department of Trade and Industry, "ETSU-R-97: The assessment and rating of noise from windfarms". This position has been backed up by appeal decisions including those at Thackson's Well and Palmer's Hollow (Melton Borough).

The Council's Environmental Protection officers have been asked to assess the noise level using the ETSU-R-97 guidance. They have concluded that although the noise calculations are not measured on site but are based on an average of rural sites, they appear to be comparable with what would be expected in this area. They are satisfied that the noise levels from the turbines specified and in the location provided, and in relation to the nearest residential properties would fall within the limitations required by the ETSU-R-97 guidance and would therefore be within acceptable limits. For the avoidance of doubt, and in accordance with the ETSU-R-97 guidance, it is recommended that a condition be attached to ensure that the noise is kept within these limits.

A lot of objectors have made the point that the turbines would spoil a currently remote, tranquil and peaceful area through noise and disturbance. Carlton Scroop and its immediate environs cannot be reasonably described as wholly tranquil as the busy A607 passes through the village. The application site, in open countryside to the west beyond the village is much quieter although not particularly remote by virtue of the settlement pattern and proximity to roads. The application site is close to a C classified road between Carlton Scroop and Hough on the Hill with the associated intermittent traffic noise. Other sources of background noise include agricultural equipment including tractors and corn dryers. The companion guide to PPS22 states that "the noise level from wind turbines is generally low and under most operating conditions, it is likely that the turbine noise would be completely masked by wind generated background noise". The overall noise impact on the peace and tranquillity of the area is therefore not considered to be significant and there is no reason to believe that the amenity of members of the public using the Viking Way for recreational purposes would be significantly detrimentally affected through unacceptable noise and disturbance.

Concerns have been raised about shadow flicker on nearby properties. The Companion Guide to PPS22 states that flicker effects have only been proven to occur within 10 rotor diameters of a turbine. In this case, with a rotor diameter of 20m, that would mean there would be no shadow flicker beyond 200m. It also states that shadow flicker only occurs inside buildings through narrow window openings during very limited periods throughout the year. As the nearest residential property is approximately 550m away, there would be no detrimental impact on domestic properties from shadow flicker.

Taking the above into account it is considered that the proposal would not be detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties through noise and disturbance.

Impact on Wildlife and Biodiversity

Some concern has been expressed by objectors about the potential impact of the wind turbines on wildlife and biodiversity and in particular on birds and bats. It cannot be guaranteed that no bird or bat would be killed or injured, and to some extent there is a national lack of data in this area. The applicant has submitted a desktop bird survey indicating that the impact on birds would be minimal. The survey is in accordance with Natural England's standing advice and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust have confirmed that they are satisfied that the proposal would have minimal impact on birds. They have requested that a condition be attached requiring post construction monitoring of bird strikes

followed if necessary by restriction of operation during times of increased bird activity such as migrations. This is considered sufficient to provide mitigation for any potential adverse impact on birds.

In respect of bats, the turbines would be located >50m from hedgerows and linear features where bats are likely to commute, forage and roost, in accordance with Natural England's guidance. Whilst there may be bat populations in nearby churches and other buildings as well as local trees/hedges, research and guidance from Natural England shows that bats generally do not stray far from such features.

Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposal would not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on wildlife and biodiversity.

Safety

The companion guide to PPS22 states that "the only source of possible danger to human or animal life from a wind turbine would be the loss of a piece of blade or, in exceptional circumstances, of the whole blade". There would be no impact on public safety as the turbine would be located approximately 140m from the closest road and 340m from the nearest public right of way (The Viking Way restricted byway) to the south, well beyond the recommended fall over distance of height + 10% and the reach or any ice thrown off. N.B. There is no statutory minimum distance of the siting of a turbine from a public right of way.

Concerns have been raised that horses could be "spooked" by the turbines. There is no firm evidence or official studies that confirms that this is the case but the British Horse Society suggests that wind turbines should be located 4 x the height of the turbines and >200m from bridleways and equestrian facilities. The guidance gives examples of the type of circumstance that could spook a horse including turbine suddenly coming into view or starting. They refer to this guidance having been drawn up when the average height of turbines was 40 – 50m, and the companion guide to PPS22 states that "whilst this could be deemed desirable, there is no statutory requirement". The impact on horses is therefore a matter of fact and degree based on the individual circumstances of each case. It should also be noted that appeal inspectors have taken different views on this issue. It has been considered that turbines are no more significant than any other distraction that a horserider is likely to encounter, whilst others have taken the view that the BHS's recommendation should be followed. Given that large scale wind turbines are three to four times bigger than the proposed turbines, and they are smaller than the 40 - 50m referred to, it is considered that 140m from the road is a reasonable separation distance and the impact would be much less than a large scale turbine at 200m. The relatively small rotor blades in relation to hub height is also a factor. The immediate surroundings of the site are open, meaning that horses being ridden along Hough Lane would be aware of the turbines from much further than 200m and that they would not suddenly come into view. There are also extremely limited circumstances where the sun would be low enough to cast shadows on the road or cause significant flicker or reflection to road users. Furthermore, there are no equestrian facilities immediately adjacent to the site.

Health

Some concerns have been raised about potential health implications. It is stated in the Companion Guide to PPS22 that there is no evidence of any damage to public health from wind turbines either from low frequency noise or vibration, and that electromagnetic radiation emissions from wind turbines create no greater risk to human health than most domestic electrical appliances.

Air Traffic and Radar

NATS have raised no safeguarding objection to the proposal. The MOD have raised no objection, subject to the developer notifying them of the height/position of the turbines and of any construction equipment etc before and after completion so the turbines can be plotted on flying charts and aircraft can avoid the area. The “strobe” impact of aviation lights has been raised. However the MOD have not requested that aviation lighting be installed in this case.

Highway Issues

The County Highways Authority are satisfied that sufficient measures would be taken to ensure highway safety is not compromised during transportation and construction as long as the transport statement is followed. They have also raised no objection in terms of highway safety from the operation of the turbines. The companion guide to PPS22 states that “wind turbines should not be treated any differently to any other distraction a driver might face and should not be considered particularly hazardous.” Taking the above into account, it is considered that the turbines would not be detrimental to highway safety, either during delivery and construction or during normal operation.

Impact on Tourism

Notwithstanding the visual impact and the impact on the setting of various heritage assets, it is not considered to be of such a scale that it would have a direct impact on tourism to Belton House or visitors using the Viking Way and the surrounding countryside and villages for recreational purposes resulting in job losses or endangering the vitality of the local villages.

Other Issues Raised

A number of issues have been raised which are not material planning considerations and have not been taken into account when making this recommendation. These include:

- The loss of unspoilt views from properties and devaluation of property
- The motivation of the applicant, lack of direct consultation with locals and the fact that the turbines would be out of site of his property as well as suggestions of other sites and forms of renewable energy on his farm perceived to be better
- Questions about the fundamental rights and wrongs of wind energy and current policy – inefficiency, public and political opposition etc

Conclusion

Wind turbines, by their nature will always be controversial and have an impact on their environment, and the level of local opposition is understandable. However, significant weight has been given to the wider benefits of the proposal in terms of contributing to national targets for renewable energy.

In conclusion, it is considered that on balance, whilst it is inevitable that the proposal would cause some degree of harm, the positive benefits of the development are sufficient to outweigh any detrimental impact that the proposed wind turbine would have on the character of the landscape, and the setting of nearby heritage assets including the nationally important Belton House.

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 proposed wind turbines would provide a source of renewable energy, contributing to a reduction in the use of fossil fuels, in line with national policy. The design, location and relatively small scale are considered to be appropriate. It is considered that the proposal would be sufficiently well separated from the nearest dwellings to ensure residential amenities are protected. Although it is acknowledged that there would be some degree of harm to the landscape character and the setting of heritage assets, on balance, it is considered that this is not sufficient to outweigh the positive wider benefits of renewable energy.

For the reasons outlined above, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance national planning policy advice contained in PPS1 (Sustainable development), PPS5 (Historic Environment) PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas), PPS9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, PPS22 (Renewable Energy), PPG24 (Planning and Noise), policies 1, 26, 27, 31 & 40 of The East Midlands Regional Plan and policies SP1, EN1 and EN3 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy and that 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.

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

2. The Delivery of components shall be in accordance with the Traffic Management Statement submitted 05 October 2011.

   Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

3. The development shall not commence until details of the external finish and colour of the proposed turbines have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and there shall be no subsequent change to the finish or colour of the turbine without the local planning authority's prior approval in writing.

   Reason: To minimise the impact on the landscape and the setting of nearby heritage assets in accordance with PPS5 (Historic Environment), policies 26 and 27 of the East Midlands Regional Plan and Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy.

4. In the event that the wind turbines are no longer used for the generation of electricity, they shall be removed as soon as practicably possible, and the land restored to its original condition.

   Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy.

5. Before the development is commenced, a monitoring programme for bird collisions at the site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The monitoring programme shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details. In the event that the monitoring programme indicates a significant detrimental impact on the local or migrating bird populations as a result of the turbines, details of alterations to the operation of the turbines shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the turbines shall be operated in accordance with the approved details.

   Reason: In order to ensure that any detrimental impact on birds can be minimised.

6. The noise level from the wind turbines, when measured in accordance with the requirements of ETSU-R-97, shall not exceed an LA90,10min of 35dB(A) up to wind speeds of 10m/s at 10m height, measured at the curtilage of any lawfully existing dwelling. Within 21 days of a request from the local authority, and following the receipt of a complaint, the wind turbine operator, shall at their own expense employ a suitably qualified and competent person to undertake an assessment of noise from the turbines in accordance with the requirements of ETSU-R-97 and supply a copy of the report to the local authority.

   Reason: In order to protect the occupiers of nearby dwellings from unacceptable noise and disturbance.

7. Before the development is commenced, the developer shall provide written confirmation to the MOD (Defence Infrastructure Organisation) of the date of the start of construction and the maximum height of any construction equipment to be used. When the development is completed, the developer shall provide written confirmation to the MOD (Defence Infrastructure Organisation) of the date of completion, and the exact height and latitude and longitude of the position of the turbines, no more than 14 days after this date. The development approved by this permission shall be carried out in accordance to these details.

   Reason: In order that this information can be plotted on MOD flying charts to ensure that military aircraft avoid the area.

8. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans submitted as part of the application: Drawing 001 (1:2500 Site Location Plan; Drawing 002 (1:500 Block Plan); Overalls/Planning (Elevations) all received 09 September 2011

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

* * * * *

NB1 **S11/2957/FULL** Target Decision Date: 26-Jan-2012

Applicant	**Marstons Inns & Taverns** c/o agent
Agent	Mr I Trew, Cerda Planning Ltd 322, Fort Dunlop, Fort Parkway, Birmingham, B24 9FD
Proposal	**Erection of a public house/restaurant, access, parking and associated works and ancillary accommodation**
Location	**Land At, South Road, Bourne**
App Type	Full Planning Permission
Parish(es)	Bourne Thurlby

REPORT

Application Category

The application is categorised as an 'other' application

Reason for referral to Committee

The application is considered to be locally controversial and also on land formerly owned by the District Council.

The proposal

The application is for the erection of a pub/restaurant on land to the south of Bourne. It would be accessed off the main roundabout to the south of the town. The actual public house would be a mixture of two-storey and single-storey elements with parking for 58 vehicles to the rear. Proposed building materials are a mixture of cedar cladding, render and red brick under a tiled roof.

The application site and surroundings

The application site is currently vacant with a spur off the adjacent roundabout entering the site. Along the north and eastern boundary of the application site is a dyke. Besides the above the application site is flat and devoid of any significant features.

Beyond the dyke to the north are a number of residential properties along with an element of planting. Of the properties adjacent to the site numbers 11 and 28 Tully Close have blank gables adjacent to the proposal. 20 - 26 Tully Close and 20 - 26 Windle Drive have rear elevations facing the site; the rear gardens of 20 - 26 Tully Close are particularly shallow. Primary windows in 62 South Road are orientated toward the front and rear although there does appear to be one bedroom window in the first floor side elevation. A public footpath runs on the opposite side of the dyke to the north and east.

Relevant site history

S02/0643 - Outline consent was granted for the erection of 'roadside services, filling station, garage and hotel' in April 2004.

S05/1353 – Outline consent was granted for the erection of a 'public house/restaurant and access road' in November 2005.

S06/0155 – Reserved matters approval was granted for the 'construction of link road and access road' in March 2006.

S06/1485 – A full application for the 'erection of petrol filling station, shop and forecourt incorporating a drive through Burger King' was refused permission in December 2006. The application was refused because of highway and archaeological concerns along with the design of the building being inappropriate.

It should also be noted that an application is with South Kesteven District Council (SKDC) for the erection of a petrol filling station on land to the immediate south of the proposed public house and would be accessed off the same roundabout (ref; S12/0220).

Policy considerations

South Kesteven Core Strategy

SP1 – Spatial strategy
EN1 – Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District
EN2 – Reducing the risk of flooding
E1- Employment Development
E2 – Town Centre and Retail Development

Site Allocation and Policies Development Plan Document (October 2011)

East Midlands Regional Plan

Policy 1 Regional Core Objectives
Policy 2 Promoting better design

National Policy Guidance

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS4 – Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth
PPS9 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
PPG13 – Transport
PPS23 – Planning and Pollution Control
PPG24 – Planning and noise
PPS25 – Development and Flood Risk

Representations received

Lincolnshire Heritage notes that the proposal would not affect any known archaeological sites of interest.

Lincolnshire County Council Minerals make no observations on the proposal.

Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue request clarification that the building is within 100m of an existing hydrant and if not provision should be made for appropriate coverage.

The Welland and Deepings Internal Drainage Board note that the application falls outside of their area and, therefore, make no observations about the proposal.

Bourne Town Council raise no objection to the application but request that suitable conditions be added about appropriate noise levels, delivery hours and opening times.

Thurlby Parish Council raise no objection to the development but make a number of observations, they are reproduced below;

- "There is an ancient milestone at the front of the site that should be protected;
- There is concern that Surface Water and Foul sewer might go into the protected Carr Dyke so we would like to see the dyke preserved;
- The wild animals in Elsea Woods might be attracted to the lights on the site and that waste food might attract vermin so a secure waste site is needed;
- There is likely to be an impact on the housing close to the site;
- This is not a Brown Field site but a Green Field Site;
- We are looking for some of Section 106 money being used in Thurlby; towards road safety particularly the cycle path between Thurlby and Northorpe on the A15. A contribution towards a crossing at Northorpe for cyclists and pedestrians crossing the road. Likewise there should be a contribution towards a bridge being erected across Car Dyke at the junction of Footpath no's 12 & 20;
- There seems to be a lack of disabled car parking spaces as only 2 spaces have been allocated.

Although this matter did not relate to the present plan there were concerns about the other potential development which could take place on the site. As a result it was resolved that we would mention this matter in a form of a question. What is the likelihood of further development on the site and in particular the petrol station and relief road"?

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust support the recommendations contained in the Extended Phase 1 habitat Survey as well as requesting the incorporation of other biodiversity enhancements, including the installation of nest boxes.

Natural England refers SKDC to their standing advice with particular regard to impact on otters and water vole.

The Environment Agency does not object to the application subject to the imposition of conditions relating to the discharge of surface water.

Environmental Protection does not object to the application subject to conditions being added about noise levels, hours of deliveries and odour abatement.

The Planning Policy Department does not object to the application and their full observations are reproduced below;

"The application site is a Greenfield site which lies to the south of Bourne immediately adjacent to and opposite existing residential development. The site has an existing access point off the roundabout and has previously been considered suitable for roadside uses, with historic planning consent which included a public house/restaurant. These consents have since lapsed and the site is not allocated or designated for any specific purpose by the adopted development plan, however the emerging Site Allocation and Policies DPD includes an aspiration to improve the road connection between Cherryholt Road and South Road and allocates land to the east of the application site for employment use (B1b). The application would not prevent the connection of this allocation site through to South Road, and alludes to

the retention of an access through the site which could provide the highway connection desired. A representation has been made about the submission version of the Site Allocation and Policies DPD that the site should be allocated for roadside services and other uses in the DPD to reflect the previous history of the site and to allow for the creation of a through road to access site B1b allocated for employment uses in the emerging DPD. This representation (as attached to my response) from the landowner/developer will be considered by the Planning Inspector at Public Examination into the DPD expected later this year.

Policy SP1 of the adopted Core Strategy identifies that new development which helps to maintain and support the role of Bourne as a market town will be allowed. Whilst the policy also states that priority will be given to sustainable sites within the built up part of the town, it does also indicate that where there is insufficient land to meet the development needs of the town appropriate sites on the edge may be considered suitable for development. In addition policy E1 of the Core Strategy establishes the council's objective to support the local economy by broadening and diversifying the employment base of the district. However policy E2 of the Core Strategy seeks to maintain the vitality and viability of the town centre by locating new town centre uses within the town centre, where development cannot be accommodated within the town centre a sequential approach should be followed with preference being given to sites within the town centre.

The Core Strategy policy framework identifies that whilst Bourne would be an appropriate location for a new food led public house and restaurant and that this type of development would contribute to maintaining the role of the town which has a growing population, the proposed location of such a use in an out of the town centre location, such as South Road, would need to be justified. To this end the applicant has provided a sequential assessment in accordance with policy EC14 of PPS4 which considers alternative sites and locations within the town centre and on the edge of centre. This report considers the availability, suitability and viability of a number of alternative sites within the defined town centre and within 300m of the town centre boundary (as defined in emerging Site Allocation and Policies DPD and) as required by policy EC15 of PPS4. The assessment considers 7 alternative sites within and on the edge of the defined town centre and concludes that none of these are suitable or available or viable for various reasons.

The evidence of the sequential assessment complies with the requirements of PPS4 and policies SP1 and E2 of the Core Strategy and demonstrates that there are no other more sustainable options available or, viable or suitable within or on the edge of the town centre for a food led public house of the specification of this proposal.

PPS4 advises that applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and not in accordance with an up to date development plan should be refused where the applicant has not demonstrated compliance with the requirements of the sequential approach or where there is clear evidence that it will lead to a significant impact on the existing centre. This proposal will provide a local facility which is suitable and appropriate for a market town such as Bourne where there is an expanding population, it will provide local jobs which will help support the local economy. The scale and nature of the proposal does not comprise the type of development which requires consideration of the impact on the town centre (as set out in PPS4). The applicant has demonstrated that the sequential approach has been followed and that there are no other more sustainable options within the town. I therefore conclude that the proposal meets the requirements of PPS4, and Core Strategy policies SP1, E1 and E2 and do not object on policy grounds to the application".

Lincolnshire County Council, as Highway Authority, does not object to the application subject to the imposition of conditions.

Representations as a result of publicity

The application was advertised in accordance with the Councils Statement of Community Involvement. The closing date for representations was the 06 January 2012. At the time of writing a total of 20 letters have been received from local residents, 19 object to the application whilst 1 letter of support has been received. A summary of the objections are drafted below;

- A public house in a predominantly residential area would be out of character with the local environment;
- Traffic generated from the proposal would be detrimental to highway safety and lead to congestion;
- Noise from the beer garden and drunken revellers would be harmful to residential amenity;
- Parking for the scheme is inadequate;
- Noise from generators along with odour from cooking would be harmful to the amenity of nearby residents;
- House values will drop as a result of the proposal;
- Opening hours are too long and will lead to the disturbance of local residents;
- The building is too large and would dominate neighbouring properties as well as lead to a loss of privacy;
- Existing wildlife on the site would be affected;
- Consideration should be had to a site close to the town centre;
- The pond to the rear of the site is a health and safety risk;
- Surface water discharge could lead to pollution of adjacent water courses;
- There is no mention of the adjacent Listed milestone near to the roundabout;
- Disposal of food waste could lead to vermin and various environmental health issues;
- Crime and public disorder will increase as a result of the proposal.

The one letter of support believes that this particular part of the town is in need of a family type pub/restaurant.

Officer evaluation

There are a number of key issues for the application and they are covered below. It should also be noted that there is a Listed milestone to the front of the A15; however, it is not to the front of the proposed public house and has not been advertised as affecting the setting of a Listed structure.

Principle of development

Planning permission has been granted for a similar form of development in the recent past, but it was not constructed. That said, it gives a broad indication that the principle of the development would be supported. In the recently adopted Core Strategy there is no specific policy or land use allocation associated with the site; however, in the emerging Site Allocation and Policies: Development Plan Document (DPD) there is an aspiration to improve the road connection between Cherryholt and South Road. Land to the east of the site is also identified as employment land in the emerging DPD. A representation to allocate the land for a public house and petrol filling station is due to be considered by a Planning Inspector when the DPD is examined at a Public Inquiry. The proposed development would not exclude a link through the land to Cherryholt Road, although it would not be provided at this stage.

Policy E2 of the Core Strategy and PPS4 aim to restrict development that compromises the viability of the town centre. As a result a sequential test has been submitted in support of the application to look at the suitability, or otherwise, of alternative sites. A total of 7 different sites were considered

within the town; however, they were dismissed as inappropriate for a number of reasons including being too large or too small as well as other constraints including viability e.g. the cooperative retail site has permission for residential development and Bourne Core Area now has a resolution to grant permission on it. It is accepted that the site is Greenfield but given the planning history to the site and broad policy support for the proposal there is not considered to be any reason to object to the principle of development.

Highway considerations

A transport statement has been submitted in support of the application and notes that the roundabout adjacent to the site has spare capacity within it. Therefore in terms of improvements or alterations to the existing road infrastructure/roundabout none are proposed. Approximately the first 80m of the road entering the site will be to an adopted standard. The proposed development would not preclude the possible future development of a link road from South Road to Cherryholt Road although it should be noted that whilst it is an aspiration to achieve this there is no policy document that identifies it as a commitment of the County Council.

In view of the above the proposal is considered acceptable in that it would not be harmful to highway safety, lead to congestion or compromise a possible future link road to Cherryholt Road.

Residential amenity

The two-storey aspect of the public house would be some 17m from the rear elevation of 20 - 26 Tully Close. In the first floor side elevation it is proposed to have a kitchen and living room window for the pub manager's residence. It is accepted that there would be an element of mutual overlooking between these windows; however, it is not uncommon in the area with there being a similar distance between 28 and 11 Tully Close. A refusal on overlooking grounds is, as a result, not considered justified nor are restrictive conditions considered necessary e.g. frosted windows. In addition, the main two-storey element of the building would face toward the A15 with the gable closest to Tully Close 9.9m in depth; the majority of buildings adjacent to the north of the site would be single storey. Therefore it is not considered that the proposal would lead to a significant overbearing impact through massing.

A noise survey has been submitted in support of the application and looked at two key areas, noise from mechanical services as well as associated deliveries. To ensure that deliveries do not occur at unsociable hours, to the detriment of residential amenity, a condition restricting the hours of delivery is recommended. Furthermore a condition should be added about the use of identified mechanical units so that they are not used between the hours of 23:00 – 07:00. The outside eating areas and play equipment are shown to be to the south of the building away from the residential properties. Whilst concern has been expressed by a number of local residents with regard to noise it is considered that with appropriate conditions any possible impacts would be kept within acceptable tolerances so as to not impact on residential amenity; Environmental Protection raise no objection to the application, subject to pertinent conditions.

Other considerations

Trees along the northern edge of the site would not be affected by the development with there being a need for a 6m easement adjacent to the dyke. This would afford a degree of screening to the development from neighbouring properties. A small group of elm trees to the front of the site would be removed but they are in a poor state and described as 'seedling trees' and make no great contribution to the character of the area. Concern has been expressed about a reduction in house values but this is not a material planning consideration.

With regard to possible impacts on the environment a habitat survey has been completed and notes that were no protected species on the site that would be affected; however, there were potential impacts from the development on animals in the car dyke. As a result of this a Riparian Mammal Survey was completed and found evidence of water vole and otter. Four recommendations have been put forward to mitigate concerns about impacts on the animals and these should be conditioned as part of any approval.

Foul water will be connected to a mains sewer. Surface water would need to be discharged via a sustainable urban drainage system and initial drawings of this show a detention basin to the rear of the car park, which would drain into the adjacent dyke. The principle of this is acceptable although final details of this would need to be approved given the number of interested parties e.g. Anglian Water, Environment Agency and the Highway Authority, and need to ensure that flooding and pollution is not an issue.

The design of the building is appropriate utilising a mixture of materials that is reflective of those on adjacent residential sites. In addition the scale of the structure is also acceptable.

Conclusion

The application site is not allocated within the Core Strategy for any use; however, previous approvals on the site indicate broad support for the development. A sequential test of alternative sites has been undertaken and there are none more preferable within the locality. The design, scale and materials of the public house are appropriate within the context. It is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on residential amenity through a dominating or overlooking impact nor through noise that may be generated. Highway considerations are also considered to be acceptable with the existing infrastructure and proposed parking arrangements suitable for the development proposed. In addition no protected species would be affected or any discernable negative impacts occur to the environment. The application is, therefore, deemed to comply with Core Strategy policies SP1, EN1, EN2, E1 and E2 without compromising emerging Policy B1of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD along with complying with guidance contained in PPS1, PPS4, PPS9, PPG13, PPS23, PPG24 and PPS25; with no other material planning considerations to indicate that the application should be determined otherwise.

SUMMARY OF REASON(S) FOR APPROVAL

The application site is not allocated within the Core Strategy for any use; however, previous approvals on the site indicate broad support for the development. A sequential test of alternative sites has been undertaken and there are none more preferable within the locality. The design, scale and materials of the public house are appropriate within the context. It is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on residential amenity through a dominating or overlooking impact nor through noise that may be generated. Highway considerations are also considered to be acceptable with the existing infrastructure and proposed parking arrangements suitable for the development. In addition no protected species would be affected or any discernable negative impacts occur to the environment. The application is, therefore, deemed to comply with Core Strategy policies SP1, EN1, EN2, E1 and E2 without compromising emerging Policy B1 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD, along with complying with guidance contained in PPS1, PPS4, PPS9, PPG13, PPS23, PPG24 and PPS25; with no other material planning considerations to indicate that the application should be determined otherwise.

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 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).

3. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc.). Soft landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate.

   Reason: Hard and soft landscaping and tree planting make an important contribution to the development and its assimilation with its surroundings and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

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.

   Reason: Hard and soft landscaping and tree planting make an important contribution to the development and its assimilation with its surroundings and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

5. The arrangements shown on the approved plan H7739/55 Revision A dated 1/12/2011 for the parking/turning/manoeuvring/loading/unloading of vehicles shall be available at all times when the premises are in use.

   Reason: To enable calling vehicles to wait clear of the carriageway of unnamed road and to allow vehicles to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety.

6. Before each dwelling (or other development as specified) is occupied the roads and/or footways providing access to that dwelling, for the whole of its frontage, from an existing public highway, shall be constructed to a specification to enable them to be adopted as Highways Maintainable at the Public Expense, less the carriageway and footway surface courses.

The carriageway and footway surface courses shall be completed within three months from the date upon which the erection is commenced of the penultimate dwelling (or other development as specified).

Reason: To ensure safe access to the site and each dwelling/building in the interests of residential amenity, convenience and safety.

7. No dwellings (or other development as specified) shall be commenced before the first 20 metres of estate road from its junction with the public highway, including visibility splays, as shown on drawing number H7739/55 Revision A dated 1/12/2011 has been completed to a specification agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

   Reason: In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway and the safety of the users of the site and to enable calling vehicles to wait clear of the carriageway of South Road and unnamed road.

8. Before any dwelling is commenced, all of that part of the estate road and associated footways that forms the junction with the main road and which will be constructed within the limits of the existing highway, shall be laid out and constructed to finished surface levels in accordance with details to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority.

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

9. Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

   Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and ensure amenity of these.

10. All surface water from parking and manoeuvring area shall be passed through a petrol interceptor prior to disposal to groundwater, watercourse or surface water sewer and the interceptor shall be maintained in accordance with manufacturers guidelines.

    Reason: To prevent possible pollution to the watercourse.

11. In respect of the plant and equipment, the Mallard Euroair AHU kitchen extract and the York RTC 20L kitchen supply cannot be operated between the hours of 23:00 and 07:00, and the noise level of all plant and equipment must not increase the external ambient noise level measured at any noise sensitive property.

    Reason: To ensure that noise generated from the plant and equipment would not be harmful to the amenity of neighbouring properties through noise that would be generated and to comply with guidance contained in PPG24.

12. No deliveries and waste collections shall take place outside the hours of 07:00 and 19:00 Mondays to Fridays and 07:30 and 18:00 on Saturdays, with no deliveries or waste collections on and Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To ensure that noise generated from the plant and equipment would not be harmful to the amenity of neighbouring properties through noise that would be generated and to comply with guidance contained in PPG24.

13. Before the use is commenced, equipment shall be installed as will suppress the emission of fumes or smell and obviate odours from frying or other cooking processes. No development shall take place until details of the equipment have been submitted to and approved by the District Planning Authority. The details as approved shall be implemented and retained thereafter.

    Reason: To ensure that any fumes from the development would not be harmful to the amenity of neighbouring properties and to comply with guidance contained in PPS23.

14. The recommendations contained in the 'Riparian Mammal Survey' shall be implemented, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

    Reason: To ensure that the development would not have a detrimental impact on protected species and to comply with guidance contained in PPS9.

15. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans submitted as part of the application:

    H7739/50 rev B
    H7739/51
    H7739/52
    H7739/53
    H7739/54
    H7739/55 rev A
    H7739/58
    Vent 1

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

Note(s) to Applicant

1. Prior to the submission of details for any access works within the public highway you must contact the Divisional Highways Manager on 01522 782070 for application, specification and construction information.
2. The foregoing is in conjunction with approvals of the road construction for the purpose of an Agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 and principally in accord with drawing 11269/100 E received 13/02/2012 by the local highway authority.
3. It is noted that drainage details have been submitted with the application but given the number of parties that have an interest over the discharge of surface water the submitted plans are not approved as part of the application and would need to be approved at a later date through the discharge of appropriate conditions.

* * * * *

NB2 **S11/2665/HSH** Target Decision Date: 29-Dec-2011

Applicant	**Mr Paul Morriss** Walnut Cottage, Main Street, Braceborough, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4NT
Agent	Shayne Andrews Design & Architecture Ltd 10, Spalding Road, Deeping St James, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 8NJ
Proposal	**Two storey side and rear extension, single storey side extension. Timber clad and pitch roof over existing garage and erection of boundary wall**
Location	**Walnut Cottage, Main Street, Braceborough, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4NT**
App Type	Householder Development
Parish(es)	Braceborough & Wilsthorpe

REPORT

Application Category

The application is a householder application.

Reason for Referral to Committee

The application is considered to be locally controversial and following discussions with the Development Management Service Manager.

The Proposal

The proposal is to extend the host property with a two-storey side and rear extension along with a single storey side aspect. The two-storey rear extension would run to the same ridge height as an existing single storey extension. In addition a detached garage will be clad in timber and have a pitch roof over. A boundary wall and gates will also be erected.

The application site and its surroundings

The host dwelling is an attractive thatch cottage in a prominent position when entering the village from the south. Located within a large plot the dwelling is identified within the Braceborough Conservation Area Appraisal as a 'building of merit'. There is an element of planting to the front of the plot that screens some of ground floor aspects, with the end gable of Walnut Cottage close to the roadside. The detached garage is not prominent in the streetscape and makes little contribution to the character of the area.

Relevant site history

None.

Policy Considerations

National Planning Policies

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS3 – Housing
PPS5 – Planning for the Historic Environment

East Midlands Regional Plan

Policy 1 – Regional Core Objectives
Policy 2 – Promoting Better Design
Policy 26 – Protecting and Enhancing the Region's Natural and Cultural Heritage
Policy 27 – Regional Priorities for the Historic Environment

South Kesteven Core Strategy

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

Representations received

Lincolnshire Heritage does not consider that the proposal would affect any known archaeological sites of interest.

Lincolnshire County Council, as Highway Authority, does not object to the application subject to a condition requiring any gates to be erected to open inwards only.

Braceborough and Wilsthorpe Parish Council feel that it would help to improve the entrance to the village and prove an asset and look attractive when completed.

The observations of the Consultant Architect are reproduced below;

"The existing building comprises a modest rendered and thatched roofed cottage of 19thC origins with later additions. The cottage is prominently sited within the village Conservation Area and is a key building at the main southern approach to the village centre. It has been designated as a "building of merit" in the Conservation Area Appraisal.

A crucial character feature of a cottage of this style and period is modesty of size and scale. Unfortunately the large extensions proposed (more than doubling the existing footprint and of equal bulk and scale) will, in my opinion, not only overwhelm the structure making it merely a minor component element of the whole but will also cause a visual and architectural incongruity to the detriment of the character, appearance and identity of the existing building. Also, and no less significantly in the context, the street scene in the vicinity will be compromised in consequence. I would advise therefore that the proposal should be resisted and, although some form of extension to the cottage should be possible. I would advise that it would best be markedly subordinate in bulk and scale as a fundamental design concept.

The erection of a pitched roof over the existing flat roofed garage will, in my opinion, serve to improve the appearance of the building in the traditional context and the new stone boundary walls and gates will provide an attractive and appropriate form of enclosure to the principal roadside site boundary".

Representations as a result of publicity

The application has been advertised in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement with the closing date for representations being 06 January 2012.

No representation has been received about the application from local residents.

Officer evaluation

The host dwelling is an attractive thatch roof property with rendered walls painted white. It is a relatively small property but set within a large plot. The main two-storey element of the building has a floor area of some 45m, a single storey extension has been erected on the east elevation.

Various alterations are proposed including a pitch roof over a flat roofed garage, as well as timber cladding the structure. A boundary wall and gates are proposed to be erected too; these aspects are not of a concern and considered acceptable.

It is; however, the scale of extension when compared to the host property that is a concern. It is accepted that the extension would have a ridge height lower than the main two-storey element and would run from the reduced ridge of the single storey extension, utilising a change in land levels to have accommodation in the roofspace. However, the extension would protrude some 9.7m in depth from the rear wall of the property and this is considered to be disproportionally large and detrimental to the character of the of the host property and wider area; it is also noticeable that the original frontage of the property is just 9m. Whilst some form of two-storey rear extension may be supported there would be a need for the proposal to be subordinate to the host property; however, the proposal does not achieve this. As noted by the Consultant Architect a crucial character feature of the property is its modest size and the scale of extension would, by virtue of scale and mass, be harmful to the character of the host property and wider street scene.

The applicant contests that there are very few original features within the building that are worthy of retention and that its current size makes it uninhabitable as a family home, and that is the reason why the scale of extension proposed is required. However, this is not an overriding issue that would allow such a large and disproportionate extension to the property. The applicant also notes that other large extensions have been allowed to other properties in the locality, but each application needs to be judged on its own merits.

In view of the above the extension is recommended for refusal by virtue of its disproportionate scale and mass with it being harmful to the character of the host property and wider Conservation Area.

Section 106 Agreement

No section 106 Legal Agreement is required for this application

Crime and disorder

It is considered that the development would not result in any significant adverse crime and disorder implications.

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 the Act will be breached.

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

1. The proposed two-storey rear extension, at over 9.7m in depth from the rear wall of the dwellinghouse, would result in a disproportionately large extension that would not be subordinate to the host property and be harmful to the character and setting of both Walnut Cottage and the wider Conservation Area. The proposal is, therefore, deemed contrary to policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy along with guidance contained in PPS1, PPS3 and PPS5; with no other material planning considerations to indicate that the application should be determined otherwise.

* * * * *

SP1 **S11/2864/OUT** Target Decision Date: 12-Jan-2012

Applicant	**Mrs Keightley** C/o Agent
Agent	Richard Willows, Plan It Building Design LLP 27, Roseland Business Park, Long Bennington, Newark, NG235FF
Proposal	**Revised outline application to provide two one-and-a-half storey dwellings**
Location	**Rear of Holmleigh, Honington Road, Barkston, Grantham, NG32 2NG**
App Type	Outline Planning Consent
Parish(es)	Barkston

REPORT

Application Category

The application is categorised as an 'MINOR' type of application

Reason for Referral to Committee

The application has been referred to Committee following request by Councillor Trevor Scott.

The Proposal

The proposal is for outline planning permission to build two, one and a half storey, dwellings with attached garages and car parking on land to the rear of Homeleigh, Honnington Road, Barkston. This application has been amended following receipt of representations, as originally proposed it was intended to build two, two storey, dwellings with attached garages.

The application site and its surroundings

The application site is an area of garden land measuring some 35 metres in depth by 25 metres in width, located to the rear (west) of a large detached dwelling (Homeleigh) facing the A607. The site is bounded to the west by bungalows which front onto and accessed from The Lees, to the south by three recently constructed dwellings granted consent in 2010 and to the north by the rear garden of a large detached dwelling, Greenacres. The site boundaries are marked by mature hedging to the north and west, with sparser and lower hedging along the boundary with the newer dwellings to the south.

Representations Received

Following receipt of the amended scheme neighbours and consultees have been re-notified.

The Ward Councillor has requested referral of the application on grounds of dominance and oppressive environment, overlooking or loss of privacy and visual intrusion. For the same reasons, the request for referral has been reiterated following re-notification.

Barkston and Syston Parish Council has objected to the application on grounds of backland development, loss of privacy, lack of details to assess impact of design, highway safety and separation distances to the bungalows located on The Lees.

Representations as a result of publicity

The application has been advertised in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement. Representations were received from and on behalf of the occupiers of 23, 25 and 27 The Leas, and Chestnuts in Thistle Court. The objections can be summarised as follows:

- Garden infilling/backland development should not be allowed.
- Loss of privacy, and light and sunlight.
- Overlooking
- Dominance, oppression and intrusion.
- Highway safety.
- Improvements will be required to local services and school.
- Properties will be difficult to sell and values affected.

Following re-notification further representations have been received from the occupiers of 25 and 27 The Leas, these are summarised as follows:

- Dominance and intrusion.
- Properties will be devalued.
- The proposal represents back garden infilling which should not be allowed.
- The proposal will be a minimum distance away from the neighbouring dwellings located on The Leas, but a considerable distance away from Holmleigh-the application site forms part of its rear garden.

Site History

Planning history of the surrounding area of relevance to the proposal is summarised below.

Outline planning permission was granted for a bungalow to the rear of Turners Crest, a dwelling located some 65 metres to the north of Homeleigh in 2007 (S07/0713/05). This dwelling has subsequently been completed (Rosewood).

Following outline permission for four two storey dwellings granted under S0/0799, full permission was granted for three two storey dwellings under reference S10/0477, these have since been completed.

Policy Considerations

National Policy

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development.

PPS 3: Housing.

PPG 13: Transport.

East Midlands Regional Policy

Policy 1: Regional Core Objectives.

Policy 13a: Regional Housing Provision.

Local Policy

Policy SP1 (Spatial Strategy) of the South Kesteven Core Strategy (2010).

Policy SP2 (Sustainable Communities) of the South Kesteven Core Strategy (2010).

Policy SP3 (Sustainable Integrated Transport) of the South Kesteven Core Strategy (2010).

Policy EN1 (Protection and Enhancement) of the South Kesteven Core Strategy (2010).

Policy EN4 (Sustainable Construction and Design) of the South Kesteven Core Strategy (2010).

Policy H1 (Residential Development) of the South Kesteven Core Strategy (2010).

Key Issues

The principle of development on rear gardens in the area has been accepted as evidenced by the planning history outlined above. The main issues in the consideration of this application are the impact of the proposal on the visual amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings and their privacy, these are considered below.

The scheme as originally proposed provided for two, two storey dwellings. Following receipt of representations the scheme has been amended to provide for two, one and a half storey dwellings with single storey rear elements.

The separation distance between the rear walls of the two storey element of the dwellings proposed and the rear of the bungalows (25 and 27 The Leas) directly opposite the site will be approximately 22 to 24 metres. This distance is reduced by some 4 metres if the separation between the rear of the bungalows and the nearest part (rear single storey extension) of the proposed development is taken. 25 and 27 The Leas have garden depths of 10-12; the proposed dwellings have garden depths of 10-12 metres from the rear of their two storey element and some 6 – 8 metres from the rear of their single storey element. In comparison, in the case of the two, two storey dwellings to the south which have been recently constructed the total separation distance to the rear of 20 The Leas is around 16 metres from the nearest two storey element and 16 metres from the nearest single storey element .

The Council has no adopted standards relating to separation distances, but as a general guide, nationally, a separation distance in of about 20 metres is considered to be acceptable for two storey dwellings. In the instance of this application, as revised, and bearing in mind that the development is no longer for two storeys, the separation distances of around 20 metres is considered to be adequate in preserving amenities.

The revised scheme now effectively provides for bungalows, albeit with accommodation in the roof space. The cross-section indicates dormer windows, but these will look into the site and face east. Roof lights are indicated on the west facing roof slope towards the rear of neighbouring bungalows on The Leas, but it is unlikely that there will be any loss of privacy or overlooking arising through these windows.

The top of the ridge of the proposed dwellings will be some 300mm above the ridge level of the bungalows on The Leas. Given the separation distance of some 20 metres between the rear walls of the proposed dwellings and those on The Lees it is not considered that there will be any adverse impact arising through over dominance, loss of privacy or overlooking.

The gable walls of the proposed development will be parallel to that of the recently constructed two storey dwellings to the south, and will therefore not impinge upon the privacy or outlook of these dwellings. Holmleigh, the garden of which is subject of this application, is over 60 metres to the east with intervening outbuildings, and planting, and any impact on its occupiers will therefore be minimal. For the same reasons any impact on Greenacres, the dwelling located to the north of Holmleigh, will be negligible.

In summary, precedent has been set in allowing development in rear gardens in the vicinity, and in this instance there should be no adverse impacts on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

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.

SUMMARY OF REASON(S) FOR APPROVAL

The proposal relates to the development of two new dwellings of one and a half storeys each on land currently comprising the rear garden of Holmleigh.

It is considered that the proposal will not cause undue harm to the surrounding area or the street scene nor will it adversely impact upon the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

It is therefore considered that the proposal is in accordance with national and local planning policy and guidance.

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. 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 use hereby permitted is commenced] or [before the building(s) is/are occupied] or [in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the local planning authority]. 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 Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

3. Before development commences on site further details relating to the vehicular access to the public highway, including materials, specification of works and construction method shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The approved details shall be implemented on site before the development is first brought in to use and thereafter retained at all times.

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

4. When application is made for approval of the 'Reserved Matters', that application shall show details of arrangements to enable a motor vehicle to turn within the site so that it can enter and leave the highway in a forward gear.The approved details shall thereafter be implemented and retained.

   Reason: To allow vehicles to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety.

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.

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

6. 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 extension, enlargement or other alteration of the building(s) shall be carried out without Planning Permission obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

   Reason: The Local Planning Authority considers that further development could cause detriment to the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties or to the character of the area, and for this reason would wish to control any future development, and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

7. 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.

8. This permission relates solely to the application as amended by Drawing No KHHR/11/011 received on 16.01.2012

   Reason: The earlier submitted drawings were unacceptable because they indicated two storey development which adversely impacted upon neighbours.

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. Prior to the submission of details for any access works within the public highway you must contact the Divisional Highways Manager on 01522 782070 for application, specification and construction information.

* * * * *

TF1 **S11/2762/FULL** Target Decision Date: 11-Jan-2012

Applicant	**Mr R Dean, Adastone Limited** The Fox, Great North Road, South Witham, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5LN
Agent	W M Farrar, A & S Designs Lindsey Cottage, 3, High Street, Castor, Peterborough, PE5 7BB
Proposal	**Installation of portakabin for use of daytime cafe and evening security office**
Location	**The Fox Inn, Great North Road, South Witham, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5LN**
App Type	Full Planning Permission
Parish(es)	North Witham

REPORT

Application Category

This application is categorised as an "other" application

Reason for Referral to Committee

This application has been referred to the Development Control Committee at the request of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman; as well as Councillors Adams and Wilkins.

The Proposal

The application when originally submitted was to retain the portakabin which is currently situated at the site and used as a daytime cafe and a security office.

Following discussions with your Officers amended details have been submitted and which indicate a portakabin (for the same purposes) now set some 20 metres further back into the site and placed alongside the main "Fox" building. An area to the fore of the new portakabin is shown as building paved in order to accommodate 6 outside tables and with the whole being enclosed by a low level wooden paling type fence. The building itself provides 14 seats for diners.

The applicant has explained that this type of building was chosen in order to keep down building costs and to test the viability of such an enterprise.

The cafe element (and again the type of building) is mainly aimed at heavy goods vehicle drivers in view of the large parking area for such vehicles adjacent.

All services are taken from the main "Fox" building adjoining. The main "Fox" building also provides for showering/wc facilities.

To date the proposal has not promoted any further employment opportunities but this is likely to change should the venture be successful.

The application Site and its Surroundings

The application site forms part of a complex situated off the A1 and which otherwise comprises of the Fox Inn, together with its related large roughly surfaced open area for vehicle parking (around 50 spaces), another similar area abutting this, the "OK Diner" with its related surfaced and landscaped car Park, and the office and workshop recently taken over by Abacus Coaches. Otherwise the complex is surrounded by agricultural land.
The whole complex is served by deceleration and acceleration lanes from/onto the A1

On the opposite side of the A1 and slightly further South is a further service complex comprising of a vacant filling station/shop, a "Travelodge" and a "Little Chef".

Relevant Site History

SK97/0189/FULL Change of use to lorry park – Granted with Conditions – 29/10/1997

S09/0663/FULL Timber hand car wash – Granted with Conditions – 22/05/2009

Policy Considerations

Central Government Planning Policy

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS4 - Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth

PPS7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

PPG13 – Transport

SKDC Core Strategy (2010)

Policy E1 – Employment Development

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

Representations Received

Highway Agency: Offers no objection

Highway Authority: Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission. It is considered by the Highway Authority that the proposed development will not be detrimental to highway safety or traffic capacity.

Heritage Lincolnshire: No archaeological intervention is required – the application does not affect any known archaeological sites.

South Witham Parish Council (original submission): Parish Council do not like the design of the building, the external appearance is extremely shoddy, the structure is a distraction to drivers as it is very close to the roadside.

Parish Council is under the impression that on the Planning Permission lodged a few years ago for the new entrance to the car park, that this entrance could not be used until the middle reservation on the A1, a few yards North of “The Fox” was closed, has this been clarified with LCC Highways.

South Witham Parish Council (amended submission): As above, but whilst acknowledging the building has been set further back consider it still very close to road (still a distraction)

Colsterworth and District Parish Council (original submission): The Parish Council does not support this application. The site chosen to place the portakabin is in our view too close to the roadside carriageway. There is no safety barrier to protect those occupants inside from possible vehicle collision. The portakabin is not visually appealing and does not enhance the appearance of the area.

Colsterworth and District Parish Council (amended submission): Revised Plans are acceptable.

Representations as a Result of Publicity

The application has been advertised in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement with a site notice and letters to the surrounding activities/sites. No representations have been received either for or against the submission.

Officer Evaluation

These 2 complexes on either side of the A1 have clearly become over time service areas with parking and restaurant facilities. The principle of the applicant’s intention to expand and consolidate such facilities at his existing premises is accordingly an acceptable course of action.

Since the highway implications of the submission are acceptable, witness the consultation responses of the appropriate Bodies, then this largely leaves the location and design of the proposed building to be considered.

It is accepted that the design of the building is somewhat functional and bland, as the Parish Councils remark, but it is considered that in the new location proposed where it will blend with the existing “Fox Inn” structure (and particularly its existing outbuildings) this will be acceptable. The proposed building will no longer be visually dominant in the locality (as it is in its present position) and indeed will be virtually unseen when approaching the site from the North. In fact it will be a greater distance from the A1 than is the coach complex and will be almost as far back as the “OK Diner”.

In appearance portakabins already have a render finish, as has the “Fox Inn”, and that proposed is intended to be painted to match that building.

Further, it is considered that the appearance of this part of the site will actually be improved once the related patio and fencing is erected since this will shield from the A1a large portion of the somewhat visually challenged parking areas.

The submission is considered to be appropriate in this location and the proposed portakabin will not be out of character or unduly prominent. PPG13 encourages the establishment of service areas along trunk roads and particularly where these cater for heavy goods vehicles also. The proposal is deemed to satisfactorily comply with the intentions of PPS1 and with Policy EN1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Accordingly it is recommended that Planning Permission be granted subject to Conditions. In view of the mode of the building's construction and the applicant's intention to replace it with an alternative building should the activity prove viable, a time limited Planning Permission has been considered. However, in view of the limited impact of the building and its general suitability in this location such a Condition is not felt necessary.

Whilst it is expected that the existing portakabin will be moved to the new location requested this may not be the case. To avoid a situation happening where 2 portakabins actually appear at the site an appropriate Condition needs imposing to ensure the removal of the existing portakabin from its present position.

Equally since the portakabin in its present position is unacceptable because of its design, location, and visual impact Enforcement Action needs to be authorised to ensure its removal within the next 2 months (in case the Planning Permission now being recommended is not implemented). The South Witham Parish Council's comments regarding the non-closure of the central reservation to the A1 are currently being investigated.

Section 106 Heads of Terms

Not Required

Crime and Disorder

The proposed development raises no significant crime and disorder implications.

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

These 2 complexes on either side of the A1 have clearly become over time service areas with parking and restaurant facilities. The principle of the applicant's intention to expand and consolidate such facilities at his existing premises is accordingly an acceptable course of action.

Since the highway implications of the submission are acceptable, witness the consultation responses of the appropriate Bodies, then this largely leaves the location and design of the proposed building to be considered.

It is accepted that the design of the building is somewhat functional and bland, as the Parish Councils remark, but it is considered that in the new location proposed where it will blend with the existing "Fox Inn" structure (and particularly its existing outbuildings) this will be acceptable. The proposed building will no longer be visually dominant in the locality (as it is in its present position) and indeed will be virtually unseen when approaching the site from the North. In fact it will be a greater distance from the A1 than is the coach complex and will be almost as far back as the "OK Diner".

In appearance Portakabins already have a render finish, as has the “Fox Inn”, and that proposed is intended to be painted to match that building.

Further, it is considered that the appearance of this part of the site will actually be improved once the related patio and fencing is erected since this will shield from the A1a large portion of the somewhat visually challenged parking areas.

The submission is considered to be appropriate in this location and the proposed Portakabin will not be out of character or unduly prominent. PPG13 encourages the establishment of service areas along trunk roads and particularly where these cater for heavy goods vehicles also. The proposal is deemed to satisfactorily comply with the intentions of PPS1 and with Policy EN1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

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. The existing portakabin shall be removed from the site prior to the commencement of the use hereby approved or within 2 months of the date of this permission whichever is the sooner.

   Reason: To ensure that the existing portakabin is removed from the site in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans submitted as part of the application:

   02-RD-11 B received on 10 January 2012

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

* * * * *

TF2 **S12/0008/FULL** Target Decision Date: 12-Mar-2012

Applicant	**Squirrel Private Pension Fund** Blenheim Way, Market Deeping, Peterborough, PE6 8LD
Agent	Mr M Vanner, TMV Architectural Design Flat 2, 1A, Douglas Road, Market Deeping, Peterborough, PE6 8PA
Proposal	**Change of Use of existing building in south-east corner of site from Use Class B2 (general industry) to Use Class D2 (dance studio) and Change of Use of part existing building in south-west corner of site from Use Class D2 (dance studio) to Use Class B1 (to allow expansion of existing offices)**
Location	**Global Centre, 113, Spalding Road, Deeping St James, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 8SD**
App Type	Full Planning Permission
Parish(es)	Deeping St James

REPORT

Application Category

This application is categorised as an 'other' application.

Reason for Referral to Committee

The application has been referred to the Development Control Committee at the request of the vice-chairman due to the potential loss of employment land/buildings.

The Proposal

This is an application for the change of use of an existing building in the South-East corner of the application site from Use Class B2 (general industrial) to Use Class D2 (dance studio) – and change of use of part of an existing building in South-West corner of application site from Use Class D2 (dance studio) to Use Class B1 (to allow expansion of existing offices) at the Global Centre, 113, Spalding Road, Deeping St. James.

Basically the application is to allow the existing Dance Studio to move into a unit adjacent to the one it now shares; and then to allow the office activity within the building it currently shares to expand into the whole of that building.

There will be no physical changes to the exterior of the 2 buildings, although some new internal walls are being created.

The Application Site and its Surroundings

The application site forms part of a complex located towards the eastern edge of Deeping St. James and fronting onto Spalding Road. The dance studio is currently over 2 floors and occupies a little under half of the existing South-Western building.

The Global Centre is mainly accessed via a single access point located slightly off-centre to the complex and off Spalding Road. The office building in the South-West corner of the application site has an additional access direct to Spalding Road. Besides serving the buildings either side of the central access the access roadway also serves a factory building (containing a number of units – some vacant) to the rear. A barrier across the roadway prevents unauthorised access to the rear. Whilst there is some parking provision to the front of the roadside buildings the majority of parking for these also takes place to the rear of the barrier.

The building in the South-East corner is of a typical industrial appearance with a part brick construction with steel cladding above – being presently occupied by B & R Fabrication Welding. Whilst this is not of full 2 storey height it does contain accommodation over 2 floors. The building in the South-Western corner is wholly of brick construction and of traditional 2 storey height.

To the East of the application site is a car sales premises.

Relevant Site History

S10/1120/FULL Change of use of office and residential building (B1/C3) to office and dance studio (BI/D2) and external alteration to factory 1 – granted with Conditions – 06/09/2010

Policy Considerations

Central Government Planning Policy Guidance

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS4 – Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth

PPG13 – Transport

SKDC Core Strategy (2010)

Policy SP1 – Spatial Strategy

Policy SP3 – Sustainable Integrated Transport

Policy E1 – Employment Development

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

Representations Received

Deeping St James Parish Council: Not yet received.

Highways: Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission. It is considered by the Highway Authority that the proposed development will not be detrimental to highway safety or traffic capacity.

Heritage Lincolnshire: Archaeological intervention not required - the application does not affect any known archaeological sites.

Representations as a Result of Publicity

The application has been advertised in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement with a site notice and letters to the surrounding activities/sites. No representations have been received either for or against the submission.
Officer Evaluation

Policy E1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy states that the Council will seek to retain and enhance existing areas of employment use in the Deepings unless it can be demonstrated that:

1. The site is vacant and no longer appropriate or viable as an employment allocation;
2. Redevelopment will deliver wider regeneration benefits; or
3. An alternative use would not be detrimental to the overall supply and quality of employment land within the district; or
4. An alternative use would resolve existing conflicts between land uses.

Policy E1 goes on to state that locally important existing employment areas which are suitable, sustainable and attractive to the market and which can continue to meet modern employment needs will be identified within the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and the Grantham AAP. These documents will also detail policy criteria to protect existing employment areas from redevelopment for other uses, unless specific criteria are met.

The application site is not referred to within the Council's Site Allocation and Policies DPD Submission document (October 2011) as being a Locally Important Existing Employment Site under proposed policy SAP5. Although this document can only be given very limited weight as it has not been through the formal Public Examination Process it is still pertinent to the proposal.

The planning history to this site is particularly relevant to the determination of this application; in that the dance academy is already established within the complex. It being considered at the time that allowing the dance academy would not be detrimental to the local economy; there seems to be no reason to believe this analysis should change. It should also be noted that there are vacant units within the complex and which would be capable of absorbing any uptake in demand. It is understood that B R Fabrication Welding are to move to one of these units.

Whilst the dance studio is not conventional employment/industry it does generate a need for employees and according to the submission the move will allow the dance studio to employ an extra part-time person (4 full time to 1 full time and 7 part time) and the (expanded) office an extra 6 full time persons (from 8 to 14).

The uses proposed for the 2 buildings raise no unacceptable conflict with surroundings buildings/users, neither will they impact detrimentally on highway safety.
Given the site's non-allocation for employment protection and that the proposal is not detrimental to overall supply of employment land/buildings (adopted Policy E1) then the application is sufficiently in accordance with pertinent Policy and the application is accordingly recommended for the Grant of Planning Permission subject to appropriate Conditions.

Section 106 Heads of Terms

Not required

Crime and Disorder

The proposed development raises no significant crime and disorder implications.

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 planning history to this site is particularly relevant to the determination of this application; in that the dance academy is already established within the complex. It being considered at the time that allowing the dance academy would not be detrimental to the local economy; there seems to be no reason to believe this analysis should change. It should also be noted that there are vacant units within the complex and which would be capable of absorbing any uptake in demand. It is understood that B R Fabrication Welding are to move to one of these units.

Whilst the dance studio is not conventional employment/industry it does generate a need for employees and according to the submission the move will allow the dance studio to employ an extra part-time person (4 full time to 1 full time and 7 part time) and the (expanded) office an extra 6 full time persons (from 8 to 14).

The uses proposed for the 2 buildings raise no unacceptable conflict with surroundings buildings/users, neither will they impact detrimentally on highway safety.
Given the site's non-allocation for employment protection and that the proposal is not detrimental to overall supply of employment land/buildings (adopted Policy E1) then the application is sufficiently in accordance with pertinent Policy of the Development Plan.

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.

Note(s) to Applicant

1. This site is within 50m of a Land Contamination Concern. Please contact Environmental Protection Services on 01476 406300 for further information.

* * * * *

LDPP1 **S11/2613/HSH** Target Decision Date: 20-Dec-2011

Applicant	**Ms S I Capon** Ford End, Gonerby Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 8HU
Agent	
Proposal	**Proposed extensions to dwelling and removal of garage**
Location	**Ford End, Gonerby Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 8HU**
App Type	Householder Development
Parish(es)	Grantham

REPORT

Application Category

This application is categorised as a Householder application.

Reason for Referral to Committee

The application is subject to a Section 106 Agreement.

The Proposal

The application is a householder application for proposed extensions to a dwelling and the removal of a garage. The amended plans submitted in relation to this application would result in the removal of the front garage which had been partially constructed, the hall to have a gable to the front elevation, the rear extension would extend by approximately 2 metres further than the original proposal, there will be an additional roof light and window to the side elevation and the roof shall be reformed. The extensions to the dwelling would have a rendered finish to match the existing dwelling and small plain roof tiles used, also to match existing. The accommodation provides for family room, hall, store, utility and extension to existing kitchen providing a breakfast room on the ground floor with and extension to existing second bedroom, formation of en-suite, conversion and extension of existing bathroom to fourth bedroom with the creation of a fifth bedroom and a bathroom forming part of the first floor side extension.

The Application Site and its Surroundings

The application site is located at Ford End, Gonerby Road, Grantham. This is a residential street and Ford End is a detached dwelling and sits between a pair of residential dwellings and a current land of open space before the entrance to Stephenson Avenue.

Relevant Site History

S10/2210 – Extension to dwelling and alterations approved 26 January 2011.

Policy Considerations

National Policy
PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS3 – Housing
South Kesteven Core Strategy
SP1 – Spatial Strategy
EN1 – Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District

Representations Received

At the time of writing this report there have been no objections to the amended plans.

Representations as a Result of Publicity

The application has been advertised in accordance with the Council Statement of Community Involvement, the closing date for representations being 6 March 2012 and no letters of objection have been received with regards to the amended plans. 3 letters of objection were received to the initial plans as summarised below:

1. Concerns about the proposed layout and the development not being in scale and character within the surrounding area.
2. Concerns about over looking / loss of privacy.
3. Concerns about loss of outlook
4. Approval would set a precedent for further development
5. Concerns about overdevelopment of the site
6. Concerns about noise and disturbance from the development and during construction.
7. Loss of light.

Should any letters of objection be received as a result of the amended plans these will be either presented in a late items paper or presented to members verbally.

Officer Evaluation

This application relates to extensions to a detached dwelling, as an alternative to a scheme which was granted planning permission in 2011. After works commenced on that scheme in October 2011 this authority considered that the development, in particular the proposed two storey extension to the front of the house, was unacceptable. This committee resolved that the planning permission should be revoked. However, that has not been necessary as the applicant agreed to stop work and has now submitted this alternative proposal.

It proposes an enlarged extension to the dwelling and the removal of the partially constructed two storey extension. The current planning permission will, in effect, be revoked by the Section 106 Agreement which is referred to below.

The amendments to the proposed development would result in the removal of the front garage, the hall to have a gable to the front elevation, the rear extension would extend by 6 metres, this is approximately 2 metres further than the original proposal, there will be an additional roof light and window to the side elevation and the roof shall be reformed.

The accommodation provides for family room, hall, store, utility and extension to existing kitchen providing a breakfast room on the ground floor with an extension to existing second bedroom,

formation of en-suite, conversion and extension of existing bathroom to fourth bedroom with the creation of a fifth bedroom and a bathroom forming part of the first floor side extension. The bulk of the extensions would be to the eastern elevation and rear northern elevation with minimal windows to the west elevation.

The extensions to the dwelling would have a rendered finish to match the existing dwelling and small plain roof tiles used, also to match existing. It is considered that there are significant differences between application S10/2210 the most significant being the removal of the garage to the front elevation.

Given the distance of the extension from properties that front Gonerby Road it is not considered that the front extension of the proposal would be detrimental to residential amenity through a dominating or overlooking impact.
In terms of design the extension would have a ridge height to the front lower than the main house with the majority of the side windows on the eastern elevation, there would also be a large amount of glazing facing toward the main garden space. The scale, design and siting of the extension is considered to respect the host property and wider area.

It is considered that the objections raised to the initial proposal as summarised above, mainly related to the creation of the front garage as approved under application number S10/2210, it is envisaged that this will remove the negative impact upon the street scene and character of the surrounding area and also remove the precedent for further similar development to the front elevation of properties within the area.
The key issues are the visual impact on the host dwelling and surrounding area and the impact on neighbours' residential amenities.
Visual impact, it is considered that the proposal in its amended form is appropriate for its context and would have minimal impact. It is considered that by virtue of the design, scale and materials to be used, the proposal would be in keeping with both the local area and the existing dwelling.
Impact on neighbours amenities, taking into account the scale of the development, the majority of the extensions being carried out to the eastern elevation overlooking open space and the northern elevation overlooking the applicants own rear garden, it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties.

Section 106 Heads of Terms

The applicant has agreed to enter into a Section 106 Agreement which prevents the construction of the previously approved (S10/2210) extensions.

Crime and Disorder

It is considered that the development would not result in any significant adverse crime and disorder implications.

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 proposed alterations and extensions are, by virtue of materials, siting and design, deemed to respect the character of the host property and wider area without having a detrimental impact on residential amenity through a dominating or overlooking impact. The proposal is therefore deemed to comply with policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy along with guidance contained in PPS1 and PPS3; with no other material planning considerations to indicate that the application should be determined.

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. The development shall be built in accordance with the materials detailed on the submitted application forms unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

   Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and to ensure a satisfactory development and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans submitted as part of the application:

   Drawing No 2187M.10.03E Proposed Floor Plans stamped Amended Plan 13-2-2012
   Drawing No 2187M.10.04E Proposed South Elevation stamped Amended Plan 13-2-2012
   Drawing No 2187M.10.05E Proposed Elevations stamped Amended Plan 13-2-2012
   Drawing No 2187M.10.06F Proposed Site Plan stamped Amended Plan 13-2-2012

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

* * * * *

PL1 **S11/2557/OUT** Target Decision Date: 16-Dec-2011

Applicant	**Mrs A K Watson** C/o Agent
Agent	Roger Hill Design Consultants Ltd 33, Mill Drove, Bourne, Lincs, PE10 9BY
Proposal	**Outline application for 2 single storey dwellings**
Location	**22b, Burghley Street, Bourne, PE109NS**
App Type	Outline Planning Consent
Parish(es)	Bourne

REPORT

Application Category

This application is categorised as a minor application.

Reason for Referral to Committee

The application has been referred to the development control committee as it constitutes a departure to the development plan.

The Proposal

This is an outline application seeking consent for access, layout and scale for the erection of 2 single storey dwellings on land to the rear of 22b Burghley Street, Bourne.

The Application Site and its Surroundings

The application site is located in a residential area and currently forms the rear garden to 22b Burghley Street, a two storey property and covers an area of 0.18 ha. To the north of the application site there is a public footpath then the end of a cul de sac on Burghley Court.

Relevant Site History

None.

Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy:

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS3: Housing
PPG13: Transport

East Midlands Regional Plan:

Policy 1: Regional Core Objectives
Policy 2: Promoting Better Design

Policy 13a: Regional Housing provision

South Kesteven District Council Core Strategy:

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

Representations Received

Bourne Town Council: No objections to 2 single storey dwellings on the site as per planning permission.
Archaeological – no affect upon any known sites.

Tree Consultant – The trees at the site have limited merit as a broad public amenity, they are however attractive in their immediate residential surroundings and may therefore be selectively retained at the discretion of the designer and their arboricultural advisor. I am not concerned therefore that their selective removal, proposed as part of the development layout, will detract significantly from the character of the immediate or surrounding locality.

Thus, I have no objections in arboricultural terms to this proposal going ahead subject to a condition requiring the protection of the retained trees 6, 7 & 8 as described in the accompanying tree survey & report.

Lincolnshire County Council Highways – No objection subject to conditions.

Representations as a Result of Publicity

The application has been advertised in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and three letters of objection have been received from local residents. The comments can be summarised as follows:

1. Object to the planned clearance of the site.
2. Cannot object to the construction of the two houses.
3. Application is at odds with Policy H1.
4. Loss of mature trees.
5. Area already densely populated without more family homes.
6. Access through Burghley Street would not be acceptable for vehicles or pedestrians.
7. A guarantee needs to be in place that the existing access to 22b is not used as a site entrance.

Officer Evaluation

This is an outline application, seeking consent for access, layout and scale, for the erection of 2 single storey detached dwellings on part of the rear garden to 22b Burghley Street a detached two storey house.

Policy H1 states that new housing development in South Kesteven during the period 2006-2026 should be planned and phased to deliver the minimum level of housing development required by the Regional Plan. In order to achieve a proper distribution of development across the District the policy sets out a framework for distributing development. In respect of Bourne policy H1 states that

development in Bourne should be restricted to that already committed via planning approval at the date of adoption of the Core Strategy.

Policy H1 clearly sets out a framework for delivering the minimum amount of housing development required in the District over the development plan period. This is however a minimum and not a maximum. Whilst the development is in the strictest of terms contrary to policy H1 of the development plan it would not compromise the overall aims of the policy. Policy H1 seeks to ensure that all major residential development in Bourne is on sites that have an extant planning consent or those which are allocated site such as the Elsea Park development. Whilst the Council would not wish to see additional large scale residential development other than these the odd small additional infill site of one or two dwellings would not compromise the overall aims and strategy of the development plan. In addition such sites can provide additional housing alternatives to those usually provided on larger residential developments.

Access to the site is proposed from Burghley Court to the north of the development, at the end of a turning head and Lincolnshire County Council Highways have raised no objection to the scheme subject to suggested conditions that have been attached.

Given the siting and orientation of the plot and dwellings to adjacent properties it is considered that the development will not result in any significant loss of light or overshadowing.

The dwellings proposed are single storey in nature and with ridge heights of 5.75 metres will have little adverse affect on the scale and character of adjacent properties in the area. The surrounding properties are mainly two-storey with varying design styles.

Section 106 Heads of Terms

Not required.

Crime and Disorder

The proposed development raises not significant crime and disorder implications.

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.

Conclusion

The proposed development will have no adverse affect upon the adjacent development or the area as a whole.

SUMMARY OF REASON(S) FOR APPROVAL

The proposals are in accordance with National Policy PPS1 and Policies SP1 and EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Stategy. The issues regarding impact upon character of the dwelling, the street

scene and amenities of neighbouring occupiers were considered as follows :-

With regard to the impact on the character of the area the development of the site in principle is acceptable as Bourne is identified as a main town. Single storey development in this location would be in keeping with the character and nature of the surrounding residential development. The impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers should be safeguarded in terms of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing. In relation to road safety and traffic movements the Lincolnshire County Council Highways Division have indicated that subject to conditions being imposed they have no objections.

Therefore the current outline application is acceptable.

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:

   (a) appearance; and
   (b) 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. When application is made for approval of the 'reserved matters', that application shall show details of arrangements to enable a motor vehicle to turn within the site so that it can enter and leave the highway in forward gear.

   Reason: To allow vehicles to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety.
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, amenity and commerce of the occupants/residents/users of the site
5. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include [proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc.); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports etc.); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant]. Soft landscape works shall include

[planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; implementation programme].

Reason: Hard and soft landscaping and tree planting make an important contribution to the development and its assimilation with its surroundings and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

6. Before development is commence on site all existing trees shown in the submitted tree survey and report shall be fenced off to the limit of their branch spread. No works (including removal of earth), storage of materials, vehicular movements or siting of temporary buildings shall be permitted within these protected areas.

   Reason: To prevent unnecessary damage to existing trees and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

* * * * *

PL2 **S12/0185/FULL** Target Decision Date: 20-Mar-2012

Applicant	**Mr M Rouse, South Kesteven District Council** South Kesteven District Council, Council Offices, St. Peters Hill, Grantham, NG31 6PZ
Agent	
Proposal	**New window, obscure glazed in 1st floor west elevation, replace ground floor window with door**
Location	**Corn Exchange, 3, Abbey Road, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9EF**
App Type	Full Planning Permission
Parish(es)	Bourne

REPORT

Application Category

This application is categorised as a minor application.

Reason for Referral to Committee

This application has been referred to the Development Control Committee as the applicant is SKDC.

The Proposal

This is a full application for a new first floor high level obscure glazed window to the west side of the building and the replacement of a ground floor window with a door to the north elevation. The use of the building is to be as a one stop shop for the library, County, District and Town Councils, Citizen's Advice and as a venue for entertainment and functions.

The application site and its surroundings

The application site is located to the rear of commercial buildings fronting Abbey Road within the Bourne Conservation Area and is currently used as an entertainment and function venue. To the north of the application site there is a car park with further commercial buildings to the east.

Relevant Planning History

In January 2012 planning permission was granted for a ground floor extension, removal of doors & replace with windows and the creation of 3 new windows.

Representations Received

Conservation Officer – No objections.

Archaeological – no affects on any known sites.

Representations as a result of publicity

The application has been advertised in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement. No representations have been received.

Planning Considerations

National Policy

Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment.

South Kesteven Core Strategy
Policy EN1 – Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District. This is a general policy containing a list of criteria which seeks to preserve and enhance the visual quality and amenity of the built and countryside environments.

Key Issues

The key issues to be considered as part of the determination of this application relate to the following:

Impact on site and surroundings.

Officer Evaluation

The proposed works will have no detrimental affect upon the overall appearance of the building itself or on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Having regard to the location of the proposed works there will be no detrimental affect upon the surrounding commercial units.

Crime and Disorder Implications

It is considered that the proposed development will not have any significant or detrimental crime and disorder implications.

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 proposed alterations would not detract from the design of the building and its overall appearance and would not spoil or compromise the Bourne Conservation Area.
As such the proposal would preserve the historic character of the conservation area and would have no detrimental affect upon the surrounding commercial units.

It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with national planning policy advice contained in PPS5 Historic Environment and Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy.

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. The development shall be built in accordance with the materials detailed on the submitted application forms unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

   Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality and to ensure a satisfactory development and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans submitted as part of the application: J80090/12, J80090/13, Proposed North and West Elevation drawings received 24 January 2012.

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

* * * * *

Report No: PLA927

Section 106 Agreement – Deed of Variation
Dysart Road, Grantham – Residential Development, Substitution of house type

PJM S11/3064/MJRF Target Decision Date: 06-Apr-2012

Applicant	**Barratt East Midlands** C/o Agent
Agent	Miss Helen Bareford, Antony Aspbury Associates Limited, 20 Park Lane Business Centre, Park Lane, Basford, Nottingham, NG6 0DW
Proposal	**Erection of 38 Dwellings**
Location	**Plots 66-81 and 85-106, Neales Crescent, Grantham, NG31 7GD**
App Type	Major Full (Residential)
Parish(es)	Grantham

REPORT

The Proposal

The proposal for the erection of 38 no. dwellings replaces the previously approved scheme for 41 no. plots on the current application sites. The application sites under consideration form part of an overall larger scheme for what were originally 166 dwellings. The application proposes the re-plan of Plot numbers 66-81 and 85-106 inclusive, which were previously approved as part of the wider redevelopment of the site under references S04/1610 (Outline) and S05/1156 (Reserved Matters). The revised scheme removes a number of 1 bed flats and 4 bed dwellings to be replaced with 2 and 3 bedroomed detached properties of a standard two- two and a half storey design.

The proposed dwellings on the remainder of the site will continue to follow the same layout as that which has previously been approved with only minor changes.

The application site and its surroundings

The application site is located immediately to the west of Grantham town centre and had been previously used for industrial purposes. And partly as an unused open space.

The current application site forms part of the previous redevelopment proposals for the site, which involved the accommodation of 98 no. plots. Parts of the original scheme have been built and occupied.

The site covers an overall area of approximately 3.58 ha, whilst the current application site incorporates 0.71 ha of land.

Access to the site is directly off Dysart Road, which passes through an industrial area after which the site opens up to an overgrown, grassed area to the north.

To the north and north west of the site are residential properties on Campbell Close, Ely Way and Chelmsford Drive. Immediately to the east of the site is a dismantled railway line, which adjoins smaller industrial units contained within Henry Bell Industrial Estate. To the east and south east of the site is industrial land and an area of unused open space.

Key Issues

Highway safety

The highway authority have not objected to the scheme in terms of the suitability of the access or the creation of additional vehicular traffic so leaving the planning authority to conclude that the proposal will not impact adversely on highway safety.

Visual Impact

The locality consists of a mix of house types ranging from detached to semi-detached properties. It is considered that the proposed dwellings assimilate with their surroundings in terms of mass and form whilst continuing the wide ranging design types that are prevalent in the area.

.A condition is recommended that will request samples of these materials for final approval in order that they match those of nearby developments.

Due to the dwellings being sited a considerable distance off Dysart Road which is the main access road to the site, it is considered that the proposals will not have an adverse visual impact on the street scene.

Impact on neighbouring private residential amenity

Impacts on neighbouring residential amenity were considered during the approval of the previous applications. It is considered that with the heights of the proposed dwellings being consistent with those already constructed on the site that the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy has not increased. The revised house types are in similar positions to those proposed on the approved layout, still maintaining a sufficient distance of separation from dwellings on Chelmsford Drive, Ely Way and Campbell Close, thus eliminating any potential adverse impacts in terms of the creation of a dominant and oppressive environment.

Section 106 Agreement

There is an existing Section 106 Agreement on the site from the 2005 approval which required the provision of Open Space and a £20,000 contribution to the Highway Department for road improvements.

The £20,000 Highway contribution on the original agreement has already been paid.

The large area of Public Open Space (POS) to be provided on site remains at the entrance to the development, to create a welcoming green gateway to the scheme. The

The Open Space Officer has no objection requesting that a LEAP (Locally Equipped Area of Play) be provided within the scheme. It is considered that the proposed open space shown on the submitted layout plan is large enough to accommodate a LEAP.

A Draft Deed of Variation has been submitted with the application which allows the obligations contained within the existing Section 106 Agreement to be applied to any new consent issued in respect of this new application.

At the time of writing the report the Legal Agreement had not been completed and signed.

Conclusion

The development will not be contrary with the requirements of national and local policy, with the proposed dwellings being sited on a brownfield site in a sustainable location, conforming to the residential uses that exist in the vicinity.

The designs of the dwellings are considered to assimilate with their surroundings and not impact adversely on the character of the area.

Due to the design and siting of the dwellings and the careful positioning of fenestration it is not considered that an unacceptable level of overlooking or loss of privacy will be created as a result of the development.

The suitable mass and form of the dwellings coupled with satisfactory levels of separation will not lead to the creation of a dominant or oppressive environment or loss of light to neighbouring properties.

The Environment Agency is satisfied with the information submitted regarding flood risk and suitable conditions have been attached.

No objection has been received from the highway department leading the authority to conclude that the proposals will not impact adversely on highway safety.

A Legal Agreement has been formulated ensuring the provision of suitable open space.

It is considered therefore that the proposals comply with National and Local Planning Policy and it is recommended therefore that planning permission be granted.

Recommendation: That the deed of variation of this Section 106 Agreement is supported to enable the planning permission to be issued.

Pat Reid
Development Management – Service Manager

AGENDA ITEM

Report No: PLA. 925

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
06 MARCH 2012

REPORT BY DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICE MANAGER

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) = 71

TABLE 2 **Applications dealt with under delegated powers from 23 January – 17 February 2012**

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**
DOCUMENT 3C **Copy of Appeal Decisions**

Table 3A lists outstanding appeals including newly submitted appeals and Table 3B lists recent decisions accompanied by a summary. Document 3C gives the full appeal decision received from the Planning Inspectorate.

TABLE 1

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Applications not determined within the statutory period

Date Prepared: 14 February 2012
No of applications over 8 weeks: 71

MAJOR APPLICATIONS
(13 weeks)

S06/1151/MJNF/JJ

Date received:
26-Oct-2011
No of days: 111

Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc
Non food retail development (6 units) with associated parking, servicing and access
Former Mirlees Blackstone Site, Uffington Road, Stamford
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting consultation replies

S07/1267/MJRF/KJC

Date received:
13-Sep-2007
No of days: 1615

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:
Development Management Service Manager to approve in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

S08/0780/MJRF/NB

Date received:
17-Sep-2008
No of days: 1245

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:
Development Management Service Manager to approve in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

S10/2106/MJRF/KJC

Date received:
21-Jan-2011
No of days: 389

Ablehomes Ltd
Demolish existing dwelling and garage and construction of 13 dwellings and associated garages
53 and land to the rear of No.s 45 - 59 (inclusive), Harrowby Lane, Grantham, NG31 9HZ
Reason for non-determination:
Development Management Service Manager to approve in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement (including uplift)

S11/0902/MJRF/NB

Date received:
21-Apr-2011
No of days: 299

Mr R Graf, Newtons Solicitors
APPEAL AGAINST NON-DETERMINATION OF APPLICATION
Creation of 3 flats from 12 bedsits and erection of 11 dwellings/flats with associated parking at land rear of 51-58 Scotgate

Blenheim Court, 51, Scotgate, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2YQ
Reason for non-determination:
Application under appeal for non-determination

S11/0967/MJRF/KJC

Date received:
03-May-2011
No of days: 287

McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles L
Demolition of 49 St Catherines Road and 1A Dudley Road and construction of retirement accommodation for the elderely including provision of communal facilities, landscaping and car parking
49, St. Catherines Road, Grantham, NG319DE
Reason for non-determination:
Amendments requested

S11/1501/MJRF/KJC

Date received:
28-Jun-2011
No of days: 231

The Orders of St John Care Trust
64 bed residential Nursing and Dementia Home (Class C2) and 72no. extra care apartments (Class C2) with associated car parking and landscaping
Land off Springfield Road, Grantham
Reason for non-determination:
Development Management Service Manager to approve in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

S11/2002/MJRO/KJC

Date received:
24-Aug-2011
No of days: 174

Andrew Rogers, JGP Properties Ltd
Outline planning permission for residential development and the formation of new vehicular access
Land Off Main Road, Long Bennington
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting additional drainage information

S11/2050/MJRF/JJ

Date received:
19-Sep-2011
No of days: 148

Mrs A Lea, Larkfleet Homes
Construction of 19 affordable dwellings
Land north of, Spalding Road, Deeping St. James
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plans and consultee comments

S11/2283/MJRO/JJ

Date received:
30-Sep-2011
No of days: 137

Burghley House Preservation Trust
Affordable housing and associated infrastructure and access and allotments
Land rear at Coronation Villas, Barnack Road, Stamford
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plans

S11/2288/MJNO/JJ

Date received:
30-Sep-2011
No of days: 137

Stamford AFC/Burghley House Pres Trust
Development of football stadium with capacity for 1500 spectators, with associated infrastructure and facilities to include multi-use training pitch, clubhouse and function rooms, and ancillary office/administrative space. Provision of car and coach parking area with additional use for car boot sales on up to 40 days in any calendar year. Creation of new means of access from Ryhall Road with associated highway alterations
Land west of, Ryhall Road, Stamford
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plans

S11/2300/MJRO/JJ

Date received:
30-Sep-2011
No of days: 137

Stamford AFC/Burghley House Pres Trust
Demolition of existing football club buildings and structures. Residential development with associated infrastructure, including new means of access with Kettering Road.
Stamford AFC, Kettering Road, Stamford, PE9 2JS
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plans

S11/2472/MJRO/JJ

Date received:
01-Nov-2011
No of days: 105

Persimmon Homes (East Mids) Ltd
Outline application with all matters except access reserved for approval for residential development
Godsey Lane/Eastfield, Market Deeping
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting consultee comments

ALL OTHER APPLICATIONS
(8 weeks)

S09/2827/FULL/JJ

Date received:
27-Nov-2009
No of days: 809

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: 809

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.

S10/0962/FULL/PL

Date received:
13-Apr-2010
No of days: 672

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:
Contamination report required.

S10/1582/FULL/NB

Date received:
15-Jul-2010
No of days: 579

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:
Officer processing application following conservation comments.

S10/1583/LB/NB

Date received:
15-Jul-2010
No of days: 579

David Pennell, Burghley House Preservation Trust
Alteration and extension to listed building
43A, High Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2LP
Reason for non-determination:
Officer processing application following conservation comments.

S10/1805/FULL/KJC

Date received:
13-Oct-2010
No of days: 489

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:
Awaiting Heritage information

S10/1978/FULL/JJ

Date received:
01-Oct-2010
No of days: 501

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:
Development Management Service Manager to approve in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

S10/2002/FULL/RV

Date received:
31-Aug-2010
No of days: 532

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 responses to consultees.

S10/2020/FULL/JJ

Date received:
03-Sep-2010
No of days: 529

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:
Awaiting amended plans

S10/2021/LB/JJ — **Mr C Riddle**

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

Date received: 03-Sep-2010
No of days: 529

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

Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plans

S11/0406/FULL/JJ — **Miss Shani Lees**

Application to extend time limit for the implementation of application of S08/0317 for construction of 9 dwellings

Date received: 17-Feb-2011
No of days: 362

59 & 65, Abbey Road, Bourne, PE10 9EN

Reason for non-determination:
Development Management Service Manager to approve in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

S11/0407/FULL/RV — **Mr C Richardson**

Conversion of existing building and garaging to No7 into separate dwelling

Date received: 07-Mar-2011
No of days: 344

Land Adj, 7, Stamford Road, Market Deeping, Peterborough

Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting consultee comments on amended plans

S11/0408/LB/RV — **Mr C Richardson**

Alterations and extension to former Maltings building within curtilage of listed building to create new dwelling

Date received: 07-Mar-2011
No of days: 344

Land Adj, 7, Stamford Road, Market Deeping, Peterborough

Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting consultee comments on amended plans

S11/0409/FULL/RV — **Mr C Richardson**

Double garage with hobbies room above

Date received: 07-Mar-2011
No of days: 344

Dane House, 7, Stamford Road, Market Deeping, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9JA

Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting consultee comments on amended plans

S11/0410/LB/RV — **Mr C Richardson**

Double garage with hobbies room above to listed building

Date received: 07-Mar-2011
No of days: 344

Dane House, 7, Stamford Road, Market Deeping, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9JA

Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting consultee comments on amended plans

S11/0485/FULL/NB — **Mr P Taylor**

Erection of dwelling on land adjacent to No10 The Grove.

Date received: 06-Sep-2011
No of days: 161

8, The Grove, Hanthorpe, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0RD

Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting additional information from agent

S11/0594/FULL/KJC

Date received:
14-Mar-2011
No of days: 337

Mr J Spilsbury
Variation of Condition 1 of S00/0471 to permit an increase in the number of shooting days from 50 to a maximum of 120 days per calender year
Stubton Gorse, Stubton
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting noise assessment

S11/0903/LB/NB

Date received:
21-Apr-2011
No of days: 299

Newtons Solicitors
APPEAL AGAINST NON-DETERMINATION OF APPLICATION
Partial demolition of Listed Building (elements to the rear) and alteration to form 3 apartments
Blenheim Court, 51, Scotgate, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2YQ
Reason for non-determination:
Appealing against non-determination of application

S11/0989/FULL/PWM

Date received:
04-May-2011
No of days: 286

Janette Broadbent
Change of use of land (path) to domestic garden (C3)
32, Minerva Close, Ancaster, Grantham, NG32 3LJ
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended landscaping scheme from Persimmon Homes

S11/1344/FULL/AH

Date received:
05-Jul-2011
No of days: 224

Mrs R Robinson & Mrs S Taylor
Conversion (partial) of existing building to 3 flats and erection of 4 dwellings
Roebuck House, 33, Broad Street, Stamford, PE9 1RB
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plans from agent

S11/1345/LB/AH

Date received:
05-Jul-2011
No of days: 224

Mrs R Robinson & Mrs S Taylor
Internal alteration to listed building
Roebuck House, 33, Broad Street, Stamford, PE9 1RB
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plans from agent

S11/1431/FULL/PJM

Date received:
16-Jun-2011
No of days: 243

Mr Peter Aust
Change of use of former railway land to garden land
Land to r/o The Old Stables Woolsthorpe Road to 15 Ingle Court (inclusive), Woolsthorpe By Colsterworth, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5NT
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting Protected Species information

S11/1507/FULL/PJM

Date received:
30-Jun-2011
No of days: 229

Mr Ian Smith
Variation of Condition 7 of planning approval S09/0852 to include alterations to front barn and internal alterations to southern wing and southern section of main building
The Cedars, Low Road, Barrowby, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 1DL
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting further details

S11/1509/LB/PJM

Date received:
29-Jun-2011
No of days: 230

Mr Ian Smith
Demolition and rebuild of barn to form dwelling and convert outbuilding (amendments to Listed Building Consent S09/0854)
The Cedars, Low Road, Barrowby, Grantham, NG321DL
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting further details

S11/1650/CAC/AH

Date received:
12-Jul-2011
No of days: 217

Mrs R Robinson & Mrs S Taylor
Demolition of garage and store
33, Broad Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plan from agent

S11/1683/HSH/RV

Date received:
26-Jul-2011
No of days: 203

Mr P Kelly
Extend roof over lounge window from porch to new pillar
19, Rowan Way, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9SB
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting plans from applicant

S11/1922/FULL/PWM

Date received:
09-Sep-2011
No of days: 158

Mr Dick Baines
Two wind turbines (hub height 26.9m, rotor diameter 20m and total ground to tip height 39.6m) and associated works
Lodge Farm, Main Street, Carlton Scroop, Grantham, NG32 3AU
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting consultee responses on additional information

S11/2009/FULL/PJM

Date received:
19-Aug-2011
No of days: 179

Mr Darren Elmes, The New Window Co Ltd
Change of use from D1 use to storage and display of double glazing products and ancillary offices
The Old Barn, Elms Farm, Frieston Heath Lane, Caythorpe, Grantham, NG32 3HD
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting signing of S106

S11/2025/LB/IVW

Date received:
22-Aug-2011
No of days: 176

Mrs L Roe
Regularisation of various internal alterations to property, installation of replacement joinery and re-instatement of stonework to front elevation
10, Rutland Terrace, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2QD
Reason for non-determination:
Researching history of building

S11/2109/HSH/PL

Date received:
01-Sep-2011
No of days: 166

Mr & Mrs D Rose
Erection of double garage in rear garden
28, Croft Drive, Grantham, NG31 9EB
Reason for non-determination:
Additional information requested

S11/2181/FULL/JJ

Date received:
06-Sep-2011
No of days: 161

David Pannell, Burghley House Preservation Trust Ltd
Proposed alteration to ventilation and extract ducting to ground floor kitchens
William Cecil Hotel, 36, High Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2LJ
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plans

S11/2182/LB/JJ

Date received:
06-Sep-2011
No of days: 161

David Pannell, Burghley House Preservation Trust Ltd
Proposed alteration to ventilation and extract ducting to ground floor kitchens
William Cecil Hotel, 36, High Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2LJ
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plans

S11/2183/FULL/JJ

Date received:
05-Sep-2011
No of days: 162

David Pannell, Burghley House Preservation Trust Ltd
Extensions and alterations (revision to previously approved scheme)
William Cecil Hotel, 36, High Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2LJ
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plans

S11/2184/LB/JJ

Date received:
05-Sep-2011
No of days: 162

David Pannell, Burghley House Preservation Trust Ltd
Extensions and alterations (revision to previously approved scheme)
William Cecil Hotel, 36, High Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2LJ
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plans

S11/2188/FULL/KJC

Date received:
09-Sep-2011
No of days: 158

Ablehomes Ltd
Construction of 4no. dwellings - Substitution of housetypes on Plots 10, 11, 12 & 14 of planning permission S10/2176
Elm Farm, Lilley Street, Long Bennington, Newark, NG23 5EJ
Reason for non-determination:
Development Management Service Manager to approve in consultation with Chairman/Vice Chairman subject to S106 agreement

S11/2209/FULL/PWM

Date received:
29-Nov-2011
No of days: 77

Mr Richard Coney, Coney Farms
Continuation of use of formerly agricultural land/buildings as a mixed use of agricultural and equestrian; retention of external alterations to mixed use building; and retention of parking area/hardstanding
Honington Grange, Frinkley Lane, Honington, Grantham, NG32 2PS
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting consultee response from Network Rail

S11/2253/FULL/SP

Date received:
18-Oct-2011
No of days: 119

Mr Martin Cooper, Soapy Joes Too
Change of use of storage building and associated land to car wash by hand and valet centre
Soapy Joes Too, Henry Bell Industrial Estate, Dysart Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 7EJ
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting additional information

S11/2254/ADV/SP

Date received:
18-Oct-2011
No of days: 119

Mr Martin Cooper, Soapy Joes Too
Banner and advertisement boards
Soapy Joes Too, Henry Bell Industrial Estate, Dysart Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 7EJ
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting additional information

S11/2291/FULL/AH

Date received:
24-Nov-2011
No of days: 82

Mr Roland Smith
Construction of pond
Land north of, Little Bytham Road, Castle Bytham
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting comments from English Heritage

S11/2347/FULL/JJ

Date received:
17-Oct-2011
No of days: 120

Ms J Sneath, The Exotic Pet Refuge
Erection of bungalow in connection with exotic pet refuge
102, Station Road, Deeping St James, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 8RH
Reason for non-determination:
Agreeing wording of condition 5

S11/2371/HSH/PWM

Date received:
26-Sep-2011
No of days: 141

Mr & Mrs P Sowerby
Retention of two conservatories, veranda, extension to Coach House and various structures within the curtilage (including fountain, fencing, CCTV cameras and landscaping works), erection of leisure building, greenhouse and cold frames within existing walled garden, construction of tennis court
Caythorpe Hall, Church Lane, Caythorpe, Grantham, NG32 3EL
Reason for non-determination:
To be referred to Secretary of State

S11/2372/LB/PWM

Date received:
26-Sep-2011
No of days: 141

Mr & Mrs P Sowerby
Extensions and alterations to listed building including retention of two conservatories, veranda, and extension to Coach House, erection of leisure building and greenhouse within existing walled garden, replacement of Coach House doors and other associated works
Caythorpe Hall, Church Lane, Caythorpe, Grantham, NG32 3EL
Reason for non-determination:
To be referred to Secretary of State

S11/2444/FULL/PJM

Date received:
18-Oct-2011
No of days: 119

Mr Dil Mohammed, Royal Tandoori
Removal and repositoning of external vents and alterations
53 - 57, London Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6ET
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting additional information on extraction system

S11/2616/HSH/RCL

Date received:
25-Oct-2011
No of days: 112

Mr A Stevenson
Proposed fencing to replace existing conifer hedges at a height of 1.98 metres to the side and rear and 1.68 metres to the front of the property
1, Dundee Drive, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2TR
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amended plans

S11/2619/FULL/AH

Date received:
15-Nov-2011
No of days: 91

Mr G Bremner
Use of land as grass airstrip and erection of building for storage of aircraft and agricultural machinery
Manor Farm, Wilsthorpe Road, Braceborough, Stamford, PE9 4NX
Reason for non-determination:
Re-consultation with neighbours on noise issues

S11/2656/FULL/NB

Date received:
31-Oct-2011
No of days: 106

Robert Beaumont, Lidl UK GmbH
Application under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act to vary condition 5 (opening hours) and remove condition 6 (delivery hours) of permission SK.93/0120/69/5
UNIT 5, Markham Retail Park, Ryhall Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 1UG
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting information from Environmental Health

S11/2679/ADV/LDPP

Date received:
02-Dec-2011
No of days: 74

Jackson Harris, 130 Aztec
Part illuminated freestanding pylon sign
89, London Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6HS
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting amendments

S11/2709/LDE/AH — **Herbert Martin**

Date received: 22-Nov-2011
No of days: 84

The use of the land as a domestic garden is the lawful use of land for planning purposes
Tham House, 56, Glen Road, Castle Bytham, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4RJ
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting Parish Council comments

S11/2762/FULL/TF — **Mr R Dean, Adastone Limited**

Date received: 16-Nov-2011
No of days: 90

Installation of portakabin (retrospective) for use of daytime cafe and evening security office
The Fox Inn, Great North Road, South Witham, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5LN
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting comments from consultees on amended plans

S11/2782/OUT/JJ — **Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc**

Date received: 23-Nov-2011
No of days: 83

Erection of pub/restaurant (with associated parking)
Former Mirrlees Blackstone Site, Uffington Road, Stamford
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting comments on retail assessment

S11/2864/OUT/SP — **Mrs Keightley**

Date received: 17-Nov-2011
No of days: 89

Revised outline application to provide two one-and-a-half storey dwellings
Rear of Holmleigh, Honington Road, Barkston, Grantham, NG32 2NG
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting comments from amended plans

S11/2913/LDE/LDPP — **Mr M Leech**

Date received: 24-Nov-2011
No of days: 82

Continued occupation of dwelling not in accordance with agricultural occupancy condition (Condition 3 of SK06/0639/89) (Lawful Development Certificate - Existing)
Rutland Cottage, Grantham Road, Barrowby, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 1ED
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting further information

S11/2921/LB/SP — **Mr Niall Brady**

Date received: 07-Dec-2011
No of days: 69

Conversion of listed outbuilding to ancillary accommodation
The Laurels, Main Street, Denton, Grantham, NG32 1JZ
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting additional information

S11/2966/FULL/NB — **Mr J Gibbison, Hereward Homes Ltd**

Date received: 29-Nov-2011
No of days: 77

Demolition of existing and warehouse and erection of 3 shops (A1 and A2) and 4 flats (alterations to planning permission S10/2833)
24, Broad Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 1PJ
Reason for non-determination:
Waiting for consultation period to expire on amended plans

S11/2971/FULL/SP

Date received:
29-Nov-2011
No of days: 77

Mrs Carol Hatcliff, Heydour Parish Council
Demolition of existing village hall and construction of new village hall
Heydour Parish Village Hall, Hall Lane, Aisby, Grantham, NG32 3NE
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting additional information

S11/3007/HSH/SP

Date received:
07-Dec-2011
No of days: 69

Mr N Brady
Conversion of outbuilding to ancillary accommodation
The Laurels, Main Street, Denton, Grantham, NG32 1JZ
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting additional information

S11/3052/TCA/PJM

Date received:
28-Dec-2011
No of days: 48

Mrs J Owens
Reduce height of 3 evergreen trees in Conservation Area
4, West End, Harlaxton, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 1HE
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting additional information

S11/3110/LB/IVW

Date received:
15-Dec-2011
No of days: 61

Mr John Kendall MBE
Alterations to Listed Building (steel mesh grills to library windows)
The Kings School, Brook Street, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6RP
Reason for non-determination:
Awaiting consultee comments

APPLICATIONS DECIDED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS FROM 23 JANUARY – 17 FEBRUARY 2012

S11/0409/FULL

Applicant:	Mr C Richardson
Proposal:	Double garage with hobbies room above
Location:	Dane House, 7, Stamford Road, Market Deeping, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9JA
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 16 February 2012

S11/0410/LB

Applicant:	Mr C Richardson
Proposal:	Double garage with hobbies room above to listed building
Location:	Dane House, 7, Stamford Road, Market Deeping, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9JA
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 16 February 2012

S11/0572/FULL

Applicant:	Blackstones Sports & Social Club Ltd
Proposal:	Replacement changing room and shelter; erection of two new floodlight columns and two additional floodlights on existing columns
Location:	Blackstones Sports & Social Club, Lincoln Road, Stamford, Lincs, PE9 1SH
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 07 February 2012

S11/1401/LDE

Applicant:	Mr Martin Foster
Proposal:	Lawful Development Certificate (Existing) - Use of land as residential garden
Location:	Greenfields House, 5, Greenfields Lane, Folkingham, Sleaford, NG34 0SH
Decision:	Unlawful Development - 10 February 2012

S11/1737/DC

Applicant:	Mr Kevin Burrows, The Belvoir Estates
Proposal:	Approval of details reserved by condition 3 (drainage works and materials) of S10/2746
Location:	1, New Row, Main Street, Woolsthorpe By Belvoir, Grantham, NG32 1NE
Decision:	Approved - 27 January 2012

S11/1758/HSH

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Richardson
Proposal:	Alterations and extensions to dwelling (revised scheme)
Location:	14, Billingborough Road, Horbling, Sleaford, Lincolnshire, NG34 0PD
Decision:	Refused by SoS - 10 February 2012

S11/2177/FULL

Applicant:	Mr P Day
Proposal:	Detached dwelling and garage r/o 55 Church Street
Location:	55, Church Street, Market Deeping, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 8AN
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 03 February 2012

S11/2193/ADV

Applicant:	Mr R J Smith
Proposal:	Display of notice board
Location:	United Reformed Church, Star Lane, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 1PH
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 13 February 2012

S11/2410/FULL

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs R Evans
Proposal:	Redevelopment of bungalow to form 2 storey dwelling
Location:	The Mayfields, 30, Church Street, Baston, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9PE
Decision:	Refused - 09 February 2012

S11/2412/FULL

Applicant:	Mrs T Cook
Proposal:	Agricultural building on land rear of Barbers Hill Farm
Location:	Barbers Hill Farm, Holywell Road, Carlby, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4EE
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 26 January 2012

S11/2414/FULL

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs O Andresen
Proposal:	Change of use and conversion of agricultural building to holiday accommodation
Location:	Thorns Farm Leisure, Thorns Farm, Thorns Lane, Barrowby, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 1EQ
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 31 January 2012

S11/2486/LB

Applicant:	Mr Alexander National Trust
Proposal:	Alteration of listed building
Location:	Belton House, The Drive, Belton, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 2LS
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 30 January 2012

S11/2558/HSH

Applicant:	Mrs P Wilson
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension to dwelling and first floor side extension over existing garage
Location:	20, Kipling Close, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2GT
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 30 January 2012

S11/2568/ADV

Applicant:	Philip Hakim, Hakim Osteopaths Ltd
Proposal:	Display of non-illuminated fascia sign and illuminated hanging sign
Location:	13-13B, Abbey Road, Bourne, PE10 9EF
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 03 February 2012

S11/2587/HSH

Applicant:	Mr Craig Marks
Proposal:	Provision of car port, new access and elevational alterations
Location:	The White House, Casthorpe Road, Barrowby, Grantham, NG32 1DW
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 09 February 2012

S11/2624/OUT

Applicant:	Mr George Fowler
Proposal:	Two chalet type bungalows
Location:	The Anchorage, Lincoln Road, Frieston, Grantham, NG32 3DB
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 26 January 2012

S11/2699/HSH

Applicant:	Kennedy Leigh Charitable Trust
Proposal:	Siting of free-standing oil tank within garden area
Location:	43, Corby Road, Swayfield, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4LQ
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 01 February 2012

S11/2700/LB

Applicant:	Kennedy Leigh Charitable Trust
Proposal:	Installation of new boiler, external vent and other associated works in relation to installation of new heating system
Location:	43, Corby Road, Swayfield, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4LQ
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 01 February 2012

S11/2737/FULL

Applicant:	Steph Hall, The National Trust
Proposal:	Installation of electrical substation housing including associated trenching works
Location:	Belton House, The Drive, Belton, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 2LS
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 26 January 2012

S11/2776/FULL

Applicant:	Mr D York
Proposal:	Replacement planning permission to extend the time limit for one storey office building and new access road to Essex Way
Location:	Victoria Stables, South Road, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9JZ
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 26 January 2012

S11/2778/FULL

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Andrew Kerr
Proposal:	Erection of gates and pillars, enlarging of access and change of use of landscaped area to residential garden including erection of fence
Location:	17, High Road, Barrowby, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 1BH
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 26 January 2012

S11/2850/HSH

Applicant:	Mr Norman Bertram
Proposal:	Front and rear single storey extension and pitched roof over garage
Location:	8, The Meadows, Long Bennington, Newark, NG23 5EL
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 30 January 2012

S11/2858/DC

Applicant:	Mr M Dodds
Proposal:	Approval of details reserved by condition 4 (materials) of S05/0804
Location:	36, Fen Road, Pointon, Sleaford, NG34 0LZ
Decision:	Approved - 09 February 2012

S11/2893/HSH

Applicant:	Mrs D Odams
Proposal:	Single storey extension to rear and loft conversion
Location:	77, Brewery Hill, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6DW
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 23 January 2012

S11/2896/FULL

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs R Potts
Proposal:	Demolition of workshop and erection of bungalow (amendments to previously approved S10/2083)
Location:	R/o 20a Costa Row, Long Bennington, Newark, NG23 5DY
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 02 February 2012

S11/2909/FULL

Applicant:	Mrs Sandra Jackson
Proposal:	Use of part of room in house for hairdressing
Location:	41, Caithness Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2TF
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 01 February 2012

S11/2914/FULL

Applicant:	Croft Commercial Developments Ltd
Proposal:	Formation of separate flat above shop with associated external and internal alterations
Location:	32, St Marys Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2DS
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 23 January 2012

S11/2915/LB

Applicant:	Croft Commercial Developments Ltd
Proposal:	Formation of separate flat above shop with associated external and internal alterations
Location:	32, St Marys Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2DS
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 23 January 2012

S11/2923/MJRR

Applicant:	Ms L Mihaita, David Wilson Homes North Midlands
Proposal:	Application under Section 73 for a Variation of Condition 1 of S10/1594 to allow minor amendments to layout
Location:	Plots 95-100 and 102-103 Zone 4, Elsea Park, Bourne
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 14 February 2012

S11/2925/FULL

Applicant:	AG & ML Woolley
Proposal:	Extension to existing menage
Location:	land r/o Poplars Farm, High Street, Carlby, Stamford, PE9 4LX
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 26 January 2012

S11/2932/OUT

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs J Kearsey
Proposal:	One dwelling and attached garage with access off Lincoln Road
Location:	Adjacent 20b Old Lincoln Road, Caythorpe, Grantham, NG32 3DF
Decision:	Refused - 26 January 2012

S11/2950/HSH

Applicant:	Mr Anthony Barwell
Proposal:	Clad pre-fabricated garage with brick and erection of replacement shed
Location:	The Stables, Main Street, Braceborough, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4NT
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 01 February 2012

S11/2952/LB

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs J Lowe
Proposal:	Replacement of single glazed windows with timber framed double glazed window and replacement of external doors
Location:	46, Church Street, Long Bennington, Newark, NG23 5EN
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 07 February 2012

S11/2955/FULL

Applicant:	Miss M Hawkins, Animates Veterinary Clinic Ltd
Proposal:	Change of use from office and storage warehouse to small animal veterinary practice
Location:	106, Church Street, Market Deeping, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 8AL
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 25 January 2012

S11/2956/CDC

Applicant:	Paul Holmes, Lincolnshire County Council
Proposal:	Construction of new academic buildings for Priory Ruskin Academy
Location:	Central Technology & Sports College, Rushcliffe Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 8ED
Decision:	No objections made - 02 February 2012

S11/2966/FULL

Applicant:	Mr J Gibbison, Hereward Homes Ltd
Proposal:	Demolition of existing and warehouse and erection of 3 shops (A1 and A2) and 4 flats (alterations to planning permission S10/2833)
Location:	24, Broad Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 1PJ
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 17 February 2012

S11/2967/FULL

Applicant:	Mr W Cole
Proposal:	First floor extension to create office
Location:	Starlite House, Star Lane, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 1PH
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 26 January 2012

S11/2968/LB

Applicant:	Grantham The Kings School
Proposal:	Strip and replace existing slate-tiled roof to Newton Library together with minor internal repairs and reinstate head to Pelican finial on western gable
Location:	The Kings School, Brook Street, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6RP
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 24 January 2012

S11/2982/HSH

Applicant:	Mr James Irvine
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension
Location:	13, Argyll Way, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2XQ
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 25 January 2012

S11/2983/LDE

Applicant:	Knossington Grange School Limited
Proposal:	The use of the dwelling for use Class 3 (B), occupation by up to 6 people living as a single household (existing use)
Location:	Southview Farm, Tinwell Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2JL
Decision:	Lawful Development - 26 January 2012

S11/2984/HSH

Applicant:	Garry Richardson
Proposal:	Retention of conservatory
Location:	1, Gleneagles Close, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2TL
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 06 February 2012

S11/2985/HSH

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Weaver
Proposal:	Single storey rear and side extensions to dwelling
Location:	14, Angus Close, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2YU
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 27 January 2012

S11/2989/HSH

Applicant:	Mr James Coomber
Proposal:	Demolition of detached garage and erection of single storey side extension
Location:	Arrietta, The Paddocks, Long Bennington, Newark, NG23 5DZ
Decision:	Refused - 02 February 2012

S11/2991/HSH

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs P Griffiths
Proposal:	Erection of two storey side extension (to replace existing garage and part kitchen), provision of hipped roof to existing side extension, provision of sloping roof to garage projection and porch
Location:	28, Horsegate, Deeping St James, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 8EW
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 27 January 2012

S11/3006/FULL

Applicant:	Mr Richard Porter
Proposal:	Conversion of domestic garage to accommodation for seasonal workers and use as holiday let
Location:	Stone Horse Farm, Hough Lane, Carlton Scroop, Grantham, NG32 3BB
Decision:	Refused - 09 February 2012

S11/3017/FULL

Applicant:	Richard Green, Lark Energy Limited
Proposal:	Installation of photovoltaic solar panels to roof of industrial unit
Location:	Global Centre, 113, Spalding Road, Deeping St James, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 8SD
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 23 January 2012

S11/3042/FULL

Applicant:	Robert Bradley-Richards, William Hill Organization Limited
Proposal:	Change of use from amusement arcade (sui generis) to betting shop (A2) and alterations to shopfront
Location:	11, Silver Lane, Stamford, PE9 2BT
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 01 February 2012

S11/3062/HSH

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs C Klawita
Proposal:	Stable blocks to rear of dwelling
Location:	50, Main Road, Dyke, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0AF
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 25 January 2012

S11/3063/FULL

Applicant:	Mr R Reedman
Proposal:	New vehicular access
Location:	48A, East End, Langtoft, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9LP
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 07 February 2012

S11/3066/TPO

Applicant:	William Simpson, Simpson Arboriculture
Proposal:	Removal of Lime tree
Location:	16, Langford Gardens, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 8DW
Decision:	TC&P - Work allowed - 23 January 2012

S11/3070/FULL

Applicant:	Alison Ray, Richmond Construction & Management Ltd
Proposal:	Erection of two dwellings (amendments to permission S08/0112)
Location:	The Old Station Yard, Station Road, Little Bytham, Grantham, NG33 4RA
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 08 February 2012

S11/3072/FULL

Applicant:	Mrs L Cummings, Glacialis Ltd
Proposal:	Change of use of existing domestic stables and manege to commercial livery, including provision of roof over manege; extensions and alterations to stable block to create 3 bed temporary accommodation for horse owners, new stables, store and carport; and conversion of existing domestic garage to living accommodation (amended version of previously approved scheme - S10/2889)
Location:	Hunters Lodge, Gonerby Lane, Allington, Grantham, NG32 2EF
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 02 February 2012

S11/3074/FULL

Applicant:	The West Grantham Academy St Hughes
Proposal:	Single storey extension to school to include entrance and canopy, music room, drama studio and hair salon
Location:	The West Grantham Academy St Hughs, The Avenue, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 7PX
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 14 February 2012

S11/3075/HSH

Applicant:	Mr Tony Ward
Proposal:	Erection of additional garage
Location:	148, Manthorpe Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 8DL
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 02 February 2012

S11/3076/TCA

Applicant:	Mr John Forman
Proposal:	Remove 21 cypress trees, two poplar trees, two walnut trees and one apple, laburnum, robina, white beam and one unknown species, pollard 12 poplars to 5m, remove crown of cedar tree and minor pruning of other trees
Location:	The Rickstones, Back Lane, Westborough, Newark, NG23 5HQ
Decision:	TC&P - Work allowed - 24 January 2012

S11/3081/HSH

Applicant:	Kate Payne
Proposal:	First floor side extension above garage and conservatory to the rear
Location:	20, Wellfield Close, South Witham, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5SN
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 25 January 2012

S11/3087/FULL

Applicant:	Jeremy Burton, Escargot Properties Limited
Proposal:	Extension of time limit for implementation of planning permission ref S08/1162 in relation to erection of 4 no flats and replacement single garage
Location:	Land Off, Gas Street, Stamford
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 25 January 2012

S11/3088/HSH

Applicant:	Dr A Adams
Proposal:	Erect trellis along boundary fence and an enclosure on decking around spa
Location:	2, Forge Court, Market Deeping, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 8UG
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 01 February 2012

S11/3093/HSH

Applicant:	Mr Marcus Wallace
Proposal:	Single storey extensions to rear and rebuilding stone boundary wall
Location:	17, High Street, Morton, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 0NR
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 06 February 2012

S11/3108/HSH

Applicant:	Mr S Edwards
Proposal:	Rear garden room extension
Location:	The Beeches, 2, Old Hall Spinney, Honington, Grantham, NG32 2PU
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 16 February 2012

S11/3111/LB

Applicant:	Mr John Kendall MBE
Proposal:	Alterations to Listed Building
Location:	The Kings School, Brook Street, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6RP
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 15 February 2012

S11/3119/FULL

Applicant:	Mr Jeff Hempsall
Proposal:	Erection of a two storey dwelling
Location:	Plot adjacent 152, Alexandra Road, Grantham, NG317AP
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 09 February 2012

S11/3124/HSH

Applicant:	Mr Peter Wing
Proposal:	First floor extension above existing garage and utility room
Location:	16, Webster Way, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 8GH
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 02 February 2012

S11/3125/HSH

Applicant:	Mr David Barker
Proposal:	Single storey extension to side/rear and erection of detached garage
Location:	14, Salisbury Close, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 8RD
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 10 February 2012

S11/3138/HSH

Applicant:	Mr John Talbot
Proposal:	Detached garage to front of dwelling
Location:	4, Church Lane, Great Gonerby, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 8LU
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 13 February 2012

S11/3140/HSH

Applicant:	Mrs P Gearing
Proposal:	Two storey extension to rear of dwelling
Location:	62, Truesdale Gardens, Langtoft, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9QQ
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 10 February 2012

S11/3142/FULL

Applicant:	Mrs Lesley Sparrow, Little Sew and Sew
Proposal:	Change of use of motorcycle showroom and sales to a mixed use of sewing and threadcraft centre including training with cafe facilities and ancillary sales counter
Location:	46, Watergate, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6PR
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 10 February 2012

S11/3143/FULL

Applicant:	Mrs A Madigan
Proposal:	Replacement dwelling and garage incl demolition of ex bungalow
Location:	The Willows, Newark Road, Dry Doddington, Newark, NG23 5JB
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 02 February 2012

S11/3149/FULL

Applicant:	Mr 0 Hakim
Proposal:	Variation of Condition 2 to include the premises to be used for an osteopathic and complementary health care practice with the scope to include allied therapy's such as (but not exclusively) acupuncture, chiropody, hypnotherapy, nutritional therapy, physiotherapy, podiatry, sports massage of p/p S11/2308
Location:	13-13B, Abbey Road, Bourne, PE10 9EF
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 30 January 2012

S11/3150/HR

Applicant:	Anglian Water Services
Proposal:	Removal of 33 x 5m sections of hedgerow to allow for construction of replacement water main
Location:	From roundabout at Old Somerby to PAS at Easton (B6403)
Decision:	Withdrawn - 26 January 2012

S11/3155/HSH

Applicant:	Mr David Stiff
Proposal:	Two storey and single storey extension to rear of existing dwelling
Location:	68, Gorse Road, Grantham, NG319LQ
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 14 February 2012

S11/3158/ADV

Applicant:	Mr M Bird
Proposal:	Display of 2 non-illuminated fascia panels
Location:	Martin Bird Photography, 8-10, High Street, Market Deeping, Peterborough, PE6 8EB
Decision:	Refused - 14 February 2012

S11/3160/HSH

Applicant:	Mr David Bentley
Proposal:	Erection of detached garage
Location:	Keepers Cottage, Uffington Road, Barholm, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4RY
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 06 February 2012

S11/3172/HSH

Applicant:	Mr David Herd
Proposal:	Build new porch to front
Location:	2, Meadows Close, Long Bennington, Newark, NG23 5EQ
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 09 February 2012

S11/3173/DC

Applicant:	A & B White
Proposal:	Approval of details reserved by Conditions 4 (temporary track system and highway verges), 7 (colour and finish) & 9 (bird monitoring scheme) of S10/1759
Location:	Frinkley Farm, Frinkley Lane, Hougham, Grantham, NG32 2JQ
Decision:	Approved - 02 February 2012

S11/3175/FULL

Applicant:	Mr R Taylor, D Squared Holdings Limited
Proposal:	Conversion of existing flat to form 2 no. single bedroom flats with associated internal and external works
Location:	Flat above, 5, Scotgate, Stamford
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 13 February 2012

S11/3176/LB

Applicant:	Mr R Taylor, D Squared Holdings Limited
Proposal:	Conversion of existing flat to form 2 no. single bedroom flats with associated internal and external alterations
Location:	Flat above, 5, Scotgate, Stamford
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 13 February 2012

S11/3180/MJRR

Applicant:	Alison Lea, Larkfleet Homes
Proposal:	Application Order Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act for residential development (to not comply with condition 1 of application S11/0227 relating to materials)
Location:	Land off:, Broadgate Lane, Deeping St. James
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 16 February 2012

S11/3182/FULL

Applicant:	Mr J Browning
Proposal:	Demolition of existing detached dwelling and erection of a new 5 bedroomed detached dwelling
Location:	2, Rowan Way, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9SB
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 06 February 2012

S11/3190/FULL

Applicant:	Chris Rushden, Cummins Generator Technologies
Proposal:	Installation of 207 solar panels
Location:	Cummins Generator Technologies, Barnack Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2NG
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 07 February 2012

S11/3195/LB

Applicant:	Mr Lloyd Stubbs, TaxAssist Accountants
Proposal:	Alteration of Listed Building (re-paint shopfront, fascia signage, projecting sign and window graphics)
Location:	3, Watergate, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6NS
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 15 February 2012

S11/3196/HSH

Applicant:	Mr M Franklin
Proposal:	Internal alterations to single storey wing, part replace Collyweston roof and reinstate chimney (revised scheme)
Location:	The Manor House, Main Road, Tallington, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4RP
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 10 February 2012

S11/3197/LB

Applicant:	Mr M Franklin
Proposal:	Internal alterations to single storey wing, part replace Collyweston roof and reinstate chimney (revised scheme)
Location:	The Manor House, Main Road, Tallington, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4RP
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 10 February 2012

S11/3199/FULL

Applicant:	Mr Steve Ashby, Deeping St James Parish Council
Proposal:	Erection of Brazier Beacon (approx. 5.5 metres tall)
Location:	Land off, Thackers Way/ Crowson Way, Deeping St James
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 16 February 2012

S12/0002/HSH

Applicant:	Mr A Bowman
Proposal:	First floor rear extension
Location:	29, King Street, West Deeping, Peterborough, Lincolnshire, PE6 9HP
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 08 February 2012

S12/0010/HSH

Applicant:	Mr Gary Senior
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension
Location:	Ellary House, Fenton Road, Stubton, Newark, NG23 5DB
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 16 February 2012

S12/0014/TPO

Applicant:	Mr Michael Clarke
Proposal:	Fell four lime trees (1-4) and pollard fifth lime tree
Location:	Little Wood House, Main Street, Boothby Pagnell, Grantham, NG33 4DG
Decision:	Refused - 09 February 2012

S12/0017/CM

Applicant:	Miss Angela Richardson, Anglian Water Services
Proposal:	Siting of three glass reinforced kiosks to house electrical control equipment (LCC ref: PL/0225/11)
Location:	Dunsby Sewage Treatment Works, Dunsby, Bourne, PE10 0UB
Decision:	No objections made - 26 January 2012

S12/0049/TCA

Applicant:	Ms Cynthia Fleming
Proposal:	Fell sycamore tree
Location:	16, Ermine Street, Ancaster, Grantham, NG32 3PP
Decision:	TC&P - Work allowed - 16 February 2012

S12/0057/DC

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs G & E Morgan
Proposal:	Approval of details reserved by condition 2 (materials) of S11/1465
Location:	Quarry Lodge, Pottergate Road, Ancaster, Grantham, NG32 3QZ
Decision:	Approved - 30 January 2012

S12/0065/DC

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs P Sowerby
Proposal:	Approval of details reserved by condition 4 (watching brief) of S11/1903
Location:	Caythorpe Hall, Church Lane, Caythorpe, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG32 3EL
Decision:	Approved - 09 February 2012

S12/0079/HSH

Applicant:	Mr B Moody
Proposal:	Increase the height of boundary wall to footpath
Location:	32, Heathcote Road, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9JT
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 15 February 2012

S12/0086/FULL

Applicant:	Mr J Gibbison, Hereward Homes Ltd
Proposal:	Change of use of shops (A1) to financial & professional services (A2)
Location:	R/o 4, St. Pauls Street, Stamford
Decision:	Approved conditionally - 17 February 2012

S12/0100/TCA

Applicant:	Mr Nicholas Hopkins
Proposal:	Fell three poplar trees and pollard four poplar trees
Location:	The Spring Cottage, Main Road, Dunsby, Bourne, PE10 0UB
Decision:	TC&P - Work allowed - 09 February 2012

S12/0124/DC

Applicant:	Miss K Lavin, David Wilson Homes
Proposal:	Approval of details of condition 5 (car park lighting scheme) required by S10/1594
Location:	Land between, West Road And South Road, Bourne
Decision:	Approved - 24 January 2012

S12/0158/CM

Applicant:	Mr Nicholas Johnston, Ropsley Quarry Ltd
Proposal:	Periodic review of conditions (ROMP) (PL/0145/11)
Location:	Ropsley Quarry, Chain Lane, Ropsley, Grantham
Decision:	No objections made - 09 February 2012

S12/0166/NMAH

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs M Chambers
Proposal:	Non-materials amendment for side extractor vent and additional glazing bar to office window, removal of two windows
Location:	26, Gorse Road, Grantham, NG31 9LQ
Decision:	Approved - 15 February 2012

S12/0179/TCA

Applicant:	Paul Thurman
Proposal:	Removal of scots pine within conservation area (rear garden of 29 Pinfold Road)
Location:	29, Pinfold Road, Castle Bytham, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 4RG
Decision:	TC&P - Work allowed - 07 February 2012

S12/0209/HSH

Applicant:	Mr K Baggaley
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension and removal of chimney
Location:	29, Drummond Road, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9JF
Decision:	Permitted Development - 14 February 2012

S12/0234/HSH

Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Parker
Proposal:	Build roof extension to side and increase ridge height by 0.7m to create accommodation in roof space, new porch and garage to front
Location:	Steveley, Mill Lane, Oasby, Grantham, NG32 3ND
Decision:	Withdrawn - 10 February 2012

S12/0270/CM

Applicant:	John Gough, Mick George Ltd
Proposal:	Production of recycled aggregate from imported inert waste (PL/0017/12)
Location:	South Witham Quarry, Mill Lane, South Witham, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG33 5QL
Decision:	No objections made (cons) - 13 February 2012

S12/0283/LB

Applicant:	Mr Matthew Burrows
Proposal:	Replacement windows on listed building
Location:	Plum Tree House, The Green, Allington, Grantham, NG32 2EA
Decision:	Withdrawn - 09 February 2012

PLANNING APPEALS 2011/2012 (excluding Enforcements)

NO OF APPEALS DETERMINED (based on Decision Date)

	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
LODGED	56	39	57	54	37	40
DISMISSED	37	35	38	32½	27½	28½
ALLOWED	11	14	18	12½	13½	7½
WITHDRAWN	5	2	2	2	1	0
OUTSTANDING	**32**	**17**	**13**	**16**	**13**	**12**

APPEALS OUTSTANDING AT 23 JANUARY 2012

S10/0142/EIAOL CM Larkfleet Homes, R & S Pask, Namulas Pension Trustees Ltd, Trustees, A J Snarey, HPC Homes Ltd, Larkfleet Ltd 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 Land north of Grantham bound by railway, Belton Lane/High Road (A607), Manthorpe, Grantham	**Public Inquiry**	Start Date 31-May-2011 **Date of H / I** **13-Sep-2011**	
S10/2051/HSH PWM Mr & Mrs I M Crowther Two and three storey side extension to dwelling Castle View, 220, Bridge End Road, Grantham	**Written Evidence**	Start Date 29-Dec-2010 **Date of H / I** **N/A**	
S11/0798/LDP JJ Mr M Thurlby, M Thurlby & S Oliver Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) for proposed use to holiday let 6, Barn Hill, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2AE	**Written Evidence**	Start Date 15-Aug-2011 **Date of H / I** **N/A**	

S11/0902/MJRF NB Mr R Graf, Newtons Solicitors APPEAL AGAINST NON-DETERMINATION OF APPLICATION Creation of 3 flats from 12 bedsits and erection of 11 dwellings/flats with associated parking at land rear of 51-58 Scotgate Blenheim Court, 51, Scotgate, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2YQ	**Written Evidence**	Start Date 17-Jan-2012 **Date of H / I** **N/A**	
S11/0903/LB NB Newtons Solicitors APPEAL AGAINST NON-DETERMINATION OF APPLICATION Partial demolition of Listed Building (elements to the rear) and alteration to form 3 apartments Blenheim Court, 51, Scotgate, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2YQ	**Written Evidence**	Start Date 17-Jan-2012 **Date of H / I** **N/A**	
S11/1404/ADV PJM Miss Emma Prince, Bodyzone Massage Therapy Centre Perspex panel sign to frontage 1, Dysart Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6TE	**Written Representation**	Start Date 29-Sep-2011 **Date of H / I**	
S11/1584/HSH LDPP Mr Gary Bellamy Single storey garage and spa room extension The Willows, Birthorpe Road, Billingborough, Sleaford, Lincolnshire, NG34 0QT	**Written Representation**	Start Date 08-Aug-2011 **Date of H / I**	
S11/2014/HSH SP Mr & Mrs J Cowling Two storey extension to front to form habitable rooms and single storey front extension to form utility room and double garage and relocate vehicular access 4A, Belton Lane, Grantham, NG31 9HL	**Written Representation**	Start Date 16-Jan-2012 **Date of H / I**	
S11/2151/HSH TF Mrs A Jarvis Provision of 2m boundary fence to front of dwelling 1, Caithness Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2TE	**Written Evidence**	Start Date 16-Jan-2012 **Date of H / I** **N/A**	

S11/2275/ADV SP David Pennell, Burghley House Preservation Trust Ltd Provision of two fascia signs, one hanging sign and one free standing sign (retrospective application) The William Cecil, 36, High Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2LJ	**Written Evidence**	Start Date 16-Dec-2011 **Date of H / I** **N/A**	

S11/2400/LB SP Mr David Pennell, Burghley House Preservation Trust Ltd Provision of two fascia signs, one hanging sign and one free standing sign (retrospective application) to Listed Building The William Cecil, 36, High Street, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2LJ	**Written Evidence**	Start Date 16-Dec-2011 **Date of H / I** **N/A**	

S11/2612/HSH SP Mr & Mrs J Cowling Two storey and single storey front extensions to dwelling 4A, Belton Lane, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 9HL	**Written Representation**	Start Date 16-Jan-2012 **Date of H / I**	

RECENT APPEAL DECISIONS TO 14 FEBRUARY 2012

Application Ref: S11/2335/TPO NB

Planning Inspectorate No: APP/TPO/E2530/2274

Appeal Type: **TPO Fast track**

Appellant:	Mr A Sparks
Proposal:	Replace 3 Lime trees (TPO 315)
Site:	The Surgery, 40, North Road, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9BT

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal dismissed - 10 February 2012

SUMMARY

The Inspector considered there to be two key issues, firstly, the visual impact and prominence of the trees within the local environment and, secondly, whether there was sufficient justification for their removal. The Inspector noted that only the crown of the trees are visible from Galletly Close and North Street and, whilst they were not highly prominent, they did afford a degree of appreciable public amenity. Furthermore, given the relatively large rear gardens of properties on Gallelty close there was no overriding need to remove the trees to enhance the amenity of the occupiers.

Application Ref: S11/2180/TPO AH

Planning Inspectorate No: APP/TPO/E2530/2206

Appeal Type: **TPO Fast track**

Appellant:	Stuart Kent
Proposal:	Fell 1 no beech tree
Site:	North House, Casewick, Stamford, PE9 4RX

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal dismissed - 10 February 2012

SUMMARY

The appellants proposed to remove one beech tree but the Inspector noted that it was visible from many vantage points within the Conservation Area, including a public footpath. As a result it was identified that there would need to be an overriding consideration to support removal of the tree, which contributes to the character of the area. The appellants wanted to remove the tree in case it fell and caused damage to properties or people; however, there was no justification put forward that this was likely to happen with the beech considered to be a good and safe specimen.

RECENT APPEAL DECISIONS TO 14 FEBRUARY 2012

Application Ref: S11/1758/HSH PJM

Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/D/11/216725

Appeal Type: **Written Representation**

Appellant:	Mr & Mrs Richardson
Proposal:	Alterations and extensions to dwelling (revised scheme)
Site:	14, Billingborough Road, Horbling, Sleaford, Lincolnshire, NG34 0PD

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal dismissed - 10 February 2012

SUMMARY

The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

The Inspector reported that the proposed extension would be a substantial structure to the rear of this traditional detached dwelling, and its scale, form and massing would dominate the host building rather than comprise a subordinate addition. It was considered that its impact would be compounded by excessive fenestration on the south elevation, and the design would be at odds with the distinctive character of the property. As a result the scheme would seriously harm the appearance of the existing dwelling.

The appeal site is located on the edge of the village and the development would therefore be highly prominent in the street scene, especially when viewed from the south on Billingborough Road and Stow Lane. The extended dwelling would be wholly out of keeping with the scale of the terrace to the west, which clearly reads as four individual dwellings, and the modest house to the immediate north of the site. The Inspector acknowledge that the development would be observed against a backdrop of some relatively large properties to the north and north-west, but considered that it would have a far greater effect on the street scene due to its proximity to the junction.

The Inspector concluded that the proposal would seriously harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy EN1 of the adopted *Local Development Framework for South Kesteven: Core Strategy* which sets out criteria for assessing development proposals, including the layout and scale of buildings, the quality and character of the built fabric and visual intrusion. It also was considered to conflict with Planning Policyn Statement 1: *Delivering Sustainable Development* which encourages high quality and inclusive design that integrates successfully with the built environment and adds to the overall character and quality of an area.

TABLE 3B

RECENT APPEAL DECISIONS TO 14 FEBRUARY 2012

Application Ref: S10/2388/MJRF KJC

Planning Inspectorate No: APP/E2530/A/11/2162804

Appeal Type: **Written Evidence**

Appellant:	Mr David Defusto, Hungerton Developments Ltd
Proposal:	Erection of 22 apartments
Site:	85, Manthorpe Road, Grantham, NG31 8DE

Appeal Decision – Date:	Appeal dismissed - 31 January 2012

The main issue considered by the Inspector was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. The depth of the two blocks combined with the height of the height of the proposal was considered to be incongruous in relation to other developments nearby.

The inspector found that the proposal would have sufficient separation distances to neighbouring properties to ensure that there would not be any significant impact on outlook, loss of privacy or noise and disturbance.

He determined that based on the response from the local highway authority the additional traffic movements would not be detrimental to highway safety or capacity. Adequate on-site car parking would be provided taking into account the sustainable location.

The Inspector came to this conclusion having taken into account the previous planning permission and the previous Inspector's decision. He concluded that on balance, despite the benefits that would arise from the development of a vacant site with new housing they would not outweigh the impact on the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

An award of costs application was refused. The Inspector concluded that unreasonable resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense was not demonstrated.

DOCUMENT 3C

The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2012

by Mick Boddy F Arbor A FICFor CEnv

an Arboricultural Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 FEB 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/TPO/E2530/2274

40 North Road, Bourne, Lincolnshire, PE10 9BT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent for the felling of three lime trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order.
- The appeal is made by Mr A Sparks, of 10 Galletly Close, Bourne, against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
- The application, No. S11/2335/TPO/APP2, dated 23 September 2011, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2011.
- The relevant Tree Preservation Order (TPO) is the South Kesteven District Council, Bourne (40 North Road) Tree Preservation Order 1995, which was confirmed on 13 October 1995. The trees are scheduled as an element of the group G2 of the TPO.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are:

   (i) The impact of the proposed removal of the trees on the local environment and amenity of the area.

   (ii) Whether or not there are sufficient grounds for the removal of the three trees.

Reasons

Impact of the proposed removal of the trees

3. The limes are specimens in the early stages of maturity growing on the neighbouring land to the rear (south) of the appellant's property, set back from the boundary fence by approximately 1.3 metres. The land upon which the trees are growing is currently being developed.

4. The western tree is the smallest of the three, this being relatively slender, and the eastern tree the largest, standing around 13 metres tall. The crowns of the three trees merge and the clearance beneath their canopies is approximately 4 metres.

5. There is a divergence of opinion between the Council and the appellant as to the extent that the lime trees are visible from adjacent public roads. Following the site visit, I therefore sought to establish where they can actually be seen from. Only the upper sections of the trees' crowns are visible over the roof of the property from the eastern end of Galletly Close. The trees can be seen from North Road to the west but only from specific view points, however, they are fully visible from the car park to the rear of the doctors' surgery at 40 North Road. The trees can also be seen from the northern end of Maple Gardens to the south.

6. Whilst not highly prominent individuals, I find that the lime trees do afford an appreciable degree of public visual amenity and, along with the remaining protected trees on the site, are locally significant. I am also mindful of the duty imposed upon local planning authorities under the Town and Country Planning Act to ensure they make provision for the preservation of trees when granting planning permission.

7. I do not consider that the absence of trees to the rear of the adjoining property, 12 Galletly Close, or along the eastern boundary of the neighbouring site affords any support for the proposed removal of the lime trees.

8. In relation to this first issue, I consider that the proposed removal of the three trees would have a detrimental impact on the local environment in visual amenity terms and is therefore undesirable. Accordingly, I take the view that the trees should only be removed if there is overriding justification for this course of action.

Reasons put forward for the proposed works

Shading

9. The principal reasons put forward for the proposed removal of the trees are shading and restriction of light to the rear garden.

10. The garden is approximately 15 metres wide by 14.5 metres deep and relatively level. As stated above, the trees are located around 1.3 metres beyond the southern boundary and are up to 13 metres tall. Accordingly, the trees will cast an appreciable amount of shade over much of the garden for a proportion of the day. However, whilst I sympathise with the appellant, I do not consider that under the current circumstances the impact of the trees is sufficiently overbearing to warrant their removal and that the alternative measures of managing the limes by pruning have not been exhausted.

Previous tree removal in the area

11. In the absence of any details, I am unable to consider the matter of trees previously being removed from the rear of the doctors' surgery on North Road.

Conclusions

12. In view of my decisions on the main issues, I have concluded that there is currently insufficient justification for the removal of the lime trees and therefore dismiss the appeal.

Mick Boddy

Arboricultural Inspector

The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2012

by Mick Boddy F Arbor A FICFor CEnv

an Arboricultural Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 February 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/TPO/E2530/2206

North House, Casewick, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 4RX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent for the felling of a beech tree (T24) protected by a Tree Preservation Order.
- The appeal is made by Mr S Kent, against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
- The application, No. S11/2180/TPO dated 6 November 2011 (sic), was refused by notice dated 19 October 2011.
- The relevant Tree Preservation Order (TPO) is the South Kesteven District Council, Casewick Hall Tree Preservation Order, 1977, which was confirmed on 16 November 1978.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are:

   (i) The impact that the proposed removal of the beech tree would have on the character of the locality and visual amenities of Casewick Conservation Area.

   (ii) Whether the reasons put forward are sufficient to justify the proposed removal of the tree.

Reasons

Impact of the proposed removal of the beech tree

3. The beech is approximately 20 metres tall and in the early stages of maturity. It is situated 1.1 metres from the side elevation of The Coach House and 6 metres from the rear corner of North House.

4. The tree is clearly visible from the public footpath that runs through Casewick Park and it is acknowledged by the appellant that it 'has merit as a public visual amenity.'

5. In relation to this first issue, I find that the beech tree affords an appreciable degree of public visual amenity and that its loss would therefore have a detrimental impact on the character of local landscape and visual amenities of the conservation area. Accordingly, I take the view that the tree should only be removed if there is overriding justification for this course of action.

Reasons put forward for the removal of the beech tree

6. The application to remove the beech tree was submitted because of the concerns of the appellant and the owner of the neighbouring Coach House, Mr Chopping, over the damage and potential injury that would be caused if the tree were to fall in strong winds. However, no evidence was submitted in support of the application to suggest that the tree is predisposed to such failure.

7. The beech tree appeared to be in good physiological condition and its general health is not in question. The application states that the tree's trunk is leaning towards The Coach House but I found it to be relatively upright, as is apparent in photograph 2 submitted with the application.

8. The tree's crown has previously been lifted and the remaining lower branches cut back to establish a reasonable degree of clearance from the adjacent dwellings. Whilst the tree is very close to The Coach House, it has not been suggested that it is damaging the property and the two seemed to be co-existing satisfactorily.

9. The appellant's concerns regarding the safety of the tree are entirely understandable given its proximity to North House and The Coach House, both of which are listed buildings. However, I could find no evidence to suggest that the tree is potentially unstable or particularly predisposed to failure. Neither do I consider there to be any foundation to the suggestion that healthy beech trees are especially vulnerable to unpredictable failure during a gale.

Conclusions

10. In view of my decisions on the main issues, I have concluded that there is currently insufficient justification for the removal of the beech tree and therefore dismiss the appeal.

Mick Boddy

Arboricultural Inspector

The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2012

by Michael R Moffoot DipTP MRTPI DipMgt MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 February 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/11/2165725
14 Billingborough Road, Horbling, Sleaford NG34 0PD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Richardson against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
- The application Ref. S11/1758/HSH, dated 19 July 2011, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2011.
- The development proposed is to alter and extend existing dwelling (revised scheme).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The proposed extension would be a substantial structure to the rear of this traditional detached dwelling, and its scale, form and massing would dominate the host building rather than comprise a subordinate addition. Its impact would be compounded by excessive fenestration on the south elevation, and the design would be at odds with the distinctive character of the property. As a result the scheme would seriously harm the appearance of the existing dwelling.

4. The appeal site is located on the edge of the village and the development would therefore be highly prominent in the street scene, especially when viewed from the south on Billingborough Road and Stow Lane. The extended dwelling would be wholly out of keeping with the scale of the terrace to the west, which clearly reads as four individual dwellings, and the modest house to the immediate north of the site. I acknowledge that the development would be observed against a backdrop of some relatively large properties to the north and north-west, but it would have a far greater effect on the street scene due to its proximity to the junction.

5. I conclude that the proposal would seriously harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy EN1 of the adopted *Local Development Framework for South Kesteven: Core Strategy* which sets out criteria for assessing development proposals, including the layout and scale of buildings, the quality and character of the built

fabric and visual intrusion. It would also conflict with Planning Policy Statement 1: *Delivering Sustainable Development* which encourages high quality and inclusive design that integrates successfully with the built environment and adds to the overall character and quality of an area.

6. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal is unacceptable and the appeal should fail.

Michael R Moffoot

Inspector

The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2012

by Mark Dakeyne BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 31 January 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/A/11/2162804
85 Manthorpe Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire NG31 8DE

- The appeal is made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr David Defusto against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
- The application Ref S10/2388/MJRF, dated 18 October 2010, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2011.
- The development proposed is the erection of 22 apartments.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr David Defusto against South Kesteven District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matters

3. I have used the description of development from the appeal form and decision notice for clarity.

4. The application was amended prior to its determination by the Council. The revised scheme, shown on amended elevations and floor plans, was publicised and the representations taken into account by the Council. No party would be prejudiced by my determining the appeal on the basis of the amended application.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

6. Manthorpe Road, the A607, is a main arterial road linking the town centre with the north-east suburbs of Grantham and settlements beyond. The character of the road changes in the vicinity of the appeal site where the tighter historic urban grain of the town centre and its environs, which lie within the Grantham Conservation Area, gives way to lower density suburban development, including large detached properties set back from the road. On the eastern side of the road an area of parkland encroaches between the built development

providing a further different townscape characteristic, whereas on the western side development gives the impression of being more continuous, albeit with a step change in character. These distinctive character areas are recognised in the Council's *Grantham Townscape Character Assessment* (GTCA).

7. The appeal site previously contributed to the developed frontage on the western side, as a large house was located towards the southern end of the plot until it was demolished some 3 years ago. There are mature trees on the site, primarily grouped close to the site boundaries. The vegetation contributes to the sylvan character of the road north of the Lodge Way/Belton Lane junction.

8. The proposal would be a more intensive development and of greater scale compared to the detached dwellings to the north and the built-form previously on the site. However, in principle it would acceptable to reflect the tighter urban grain and frontage development of the town centre in this area of transition. Moreover, to develop this prominent corner site with a building of some presence which does not replicate the existing scale of development to the north and west would be an acceptable approach in townscape terms. In this respect the key design principle for Character Area 06 in the GTCA about maintaining a two-storey scale is less relevant to the appeal site which is on the periphery of the suburban area. Some of the frontage trees would be lost as a result of this approach. However, sufficient landscaping would be retained to frame the new buildings and assist in softening its impact.

9. However, the depth of the two blocks, including the central outriggers, combined with their height, would be incongruous compared to other development nearby. This depth, which is reflected in the prominent end elevations, would be particularly noticeable on the approach along Manthorpe Road from both directions and from the park and Belton Lane opposite. The separation between the proposal and other development on the main road, together with the surrounding greenery and the topography would limit inter-visibility. However, despite these factors, the new buildings would still be perceived in the context of nearby development and as part of the overall street scene. The change in massing between the buildings in the Conservation Area and those on the appeal site would be too stark. Some variation has been built into the flank elevations but the design devices used would not be sufficiently successful in breaking up the mass of the elevations.

10. The design of the elevations would also be inadequate for this gateway site. The width of the gables and dormers and some of the fenestration below would be out of scale and poorly related to the locally distinctive buildings such as the listed Georgian house to the south. The roof pitches would be too shallow. There would be insufficient vertical emphasis, particularly to the main elevation facing Manthorpe Road. The opportunity to emphasise the corner and link the two blocks with a distinctive feature has not been taken. The prominent end elevations would be lacking in architectural interest.

11. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably affect the character and appearance of the area and detract from the setting of the Grantham Conservation Area. There would be conflict with Policy EN1 of the *South Kesteven Core Strategy* (CS) as the proposal would not be appropriate to (1) local distinctiveness, (2) the existing layout and scale of buildings, and (3) the quality and character of the built fabric and its setting. The development would not integrate into the existing urban form.

12. In arriving at this conclusion I have taken into account that planning permission was given for the conversion and extension of the original building into 12 flats in 2005. However, the plans indicate that this scheme was not comparable to the appeal proposal in terms of its scale and design. The previous Inspector's concerns about the scale of the development have not been addressed satisfactorily[1]. The appeal at North Parade referred to by the appellant involved two-storey flats in a different context[2].

Other Matters

13. The development would change the outlook from those neighbouring properties which face the site, including the nearest, No 6 Lodge Way. However, there would be sufficient separation such that the new buildings would not be overpowering or cause a significant loss of privacy to nearby residential occupiers. Comings and goings from 22 flats would not lead to undue disturbance in a residential area. The parking area would be below No 6 and could be screened. Disruption during construction would only be temporary.

14. The staggered traffic-light controlled junction of Lodge Way and Belton Lane with the A607 is not laid out to modern day standards. However, based on the evidence before me, including the response of the Local Highway Authority, the additional vehicle movements from the site would be unlikely to increase highway dangers at the junction or affect its capacity. Adequate parking would be provided within the site taking into account its relatively sustainable location.

15. I have not been provided with the development appraisal which sought to justify the lack of contributions to affordable housing, open space and education that would normally be required by Policies SP4 and H4 of the CS. However, as the appeal is being dismissed the issue is not decisive.

Conclusion

16. I have taken into account the other matters raised, including the benefits that would arise from the development of a vacant site with new housing, but these do not outweigh my findings on the main issue. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Dakeyne

INSPECTOR

[1] Appeal Decision Ref: APP/E2530/A/08/2072599 dated 16 October 2008
[2] Appeal Decision Ref: APP/E2530/A/04/1163641 dated 6 December 2005