

Minutes

Planning Committee

Thursday, 9 July 2026, 10.00 am

Council Chamber – South Kesteven
House, St. Peter's Hill, Grantham, NG31
6PZ



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL

Committee Members present

Councillor Helen Crawford (Chairman)
Councillor Penny Milnes (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Pam Byrd
Councillor Patsy Ellis
Councillor Gloria Johnson
Councillor Max Sawyer
Councillor Peter Stephens
Councillor Sarah Trotter
Councillor Charmaine Morgan

Cabinet Members present

Councillor Phil Dilks (Cabinet Member for Planning)

Other Members present

Councillor Matthew Bailey
Councillor Phil Dilks
Councillor Gareth Knight
Councillor Paul Martin

Officers

Emma Whittaker (Assistant Director for Planning & Growth)
Phil Jordan (Development Management and Enforcement Manager)
Adam Murray (Principal Development Management Planner)
Miranda Beavers (Principal Development Management Planning Officer)
Craig Dickinson (Development Management Planner)
Hannah Noutch (Senior Development Management Planner)
Charles James, Policy Officer
Amy Pryde (Democratic Services Officer)
Joshua Mann (Democratic Services Officer)
Martha Rees (Legal Advisor)

12. Register of attendance and apologies for absence

(The Committee adjourned for 15 minutes so Members had the opportunity to read the late items paper).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Paul Fellows, Harrish Bisnauthsing, David Bellamy, Paul Wood and Steven Cunningham.

Councillor Charmaine Morgan substituted for Councillor David Bellamy.

13. Disclosure of interests

Councillor Penny Milnes declared an interest on application S26/0237 as she was speaking as Ward Councillor. She would sit off the Committee for this application.

The Chairman made the following statement in relation to S26/0681:

'I make the declaration on behalf of all members that whilst acknowledging that the Agent is an SKDC employee, this would not affect how members of the Planning Committee determine the application. All members have been trained and will determine the application in accordance with their training and with an open mind'. Any members who do not feel that they are open minded to determine the application, should make a declaration to that effect and not vote on the application'.

Councillor Charmaine Morgan declared an interest as a member of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust for application S26/0237. She would remain open minded on this application.

14. Minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2026

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2026 were proposed, seconded and **AGREED** as a correct record.

15. Application S26/0237

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

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

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

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

District Ward Councillor
Stubton Parish Council

Councillor Penny Milnes
Sam Kirk

Against

Jeremy Flint

Thomas Gill

On behalf of the Applicant

Mike Sibthorp

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Stubton Neighbourhood Plan and Design Guidelines for Rutland and South Kesteven Supplementary Planning Document.
- No comments received from LCC Highways.
- Comments received from Heritage Lincolnshire.
- Comments received from Environmental Protection.
- Comments received from Anglian Water.
- Comments received from Conservation Officer.
- Comments received from Parish Council.

The following comments were made by the public speakers:

- The District Councillor felt the application posed a dilemma with tilted balance.
- That an accumulation of impacts can be collectively destructive to a small rural community.
- Concerns were raised around backhanding extending obtrusively into open countryside, impact on Stubton Hall and park, habitats, sustainability, landscape setting and character of the area.
- The Member commented on recent approval of developments within the area and that a total of 14 houses had been approved. The village had absorbed over 25% more houses in a short period of time.
- The Member suggested the application be refused under The Local Plan (DE1, EN6, EN1, EN2, the Stubton Neighbourhood Plan, the NPPF (5, 12, 15 and 16).
- Concern was raised around the character and wildlife of the area alongside the protected species of great crested newts. It was also felt the village was a tranquil place to live.
- Stubton Parish Council had submitted they do not support the proposal.
- It was felt the application was environmentally unsuitable. Stubton had around 77 homes with 12 recently approved and 5 more proposed for this application. The report confirmed a 28% increase in a short period. It was noted there was no shop, school or public transport within the village.
- It was felt that drainage was unsafe, and Anglian Water had formally objected stating that Stubton Water Recycling Centre cannot accept additional flow and that connection would risk pollution.
- That the application provided no community benefit, removes pasture lands and threatens protected species.

- Concern was raised on impact to neighbouring residents on the outlook, privacy, tranquillity and the quite rural setting of the village.
- Further concern was raised on access to the site, which could cause harm due to several existing accesses within close proximity. There were no footpaths and pedestrians would have limited protection and may have to walk along the road.
- The Agent clarified the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the character of the village.
- That the Officer report highlighted that whilst the prevailing type of development in the village was linear in style, there were also example of back land development, including St Martins Close.
- It was clarified that other planning permissions had been granted within the area.
- There would be no adverse or cumulative impact from this application.
- The existing property benefitted from a septic drainage tank and this was satisfactory under prevailing ground conditions.
- It was noted the presence of a protected species would not present a barrier to a grant of planning permission, subject to biodiversity and habitat mitigation conditions.

During questions to public speakers, Members commented on the following:

- One Member sought clarification around the number of homes within the area exceeding a certain %.

It was confirmed that there was a concern for 5 dwellings on the site and that the northern part of the site would extend beyond the last house on the frontage and would impact views to Stubton Hall and Park.

- A query was raised on where a public footpath was located in relation to the application site.

It was clarified the public footpath was next to the proposed development and ran from Fenton Road to Claypole Road.

- One Member sought clarification around the ponds in relation to the development site.

It was confirmed the nearest pond was to the south of the site, which was referred to as having the biggest impact to the site. However, there were other ponds within the vicinity to the site.

- Clarification was sought around the access to the site.

The Public Speaker clarified there was access to the proposed site, there was access to Park Cottage. Opposite the access for this site was St Martins Close and Stubton Hall was adjacent to the road. Stubton Hall was used as a wedding venue and conference centre so was used regularly throughout the week and weekends.

- A query was raised on whether all the BnG requirement would be achievable on site and not elsewhere.

The Agent confirmed that the site had every potential for BnG requirements to be met on site at outline stage but would be submitted as part of a reserved matters application.

- It was questioned whether any of the demonstrable harm could be negated.

It was noted the Planning Officer had outlined a degree of harm. The ecology and the great crested newts on adjoining land had been accepted, however, there was a mitigation via licensing to mitigate the harm. The Highway authority had not objected to any part of the application including access. It was felt there was not a degree of harm to justify the refusal of planning permission.

- One Member queried whether the willow tree at the access point would be affected.

The Agent informed the Committee the willow tree had been removed before this application had been put forward.

During questions to officers and debate, the following comments were made:

- Whether minor objections had been received.

The Planning Officer confirmed the application was outline and did not include appearance, scale etc. This application was merely to determine whether this site in principle could be used for residential development. The Officer had addressed the level of impact not outweighing the benefit of housing.

- Clarification was sought around the difference between edge of settlement and open countryside development.

It was clarified each application should be considered on a 'case by case' basis. This application would be directly adjacent to residential plots, meaning there could be a clear link to existing settlement.

- Members raised concern on the fact Stubton was a small rural village.

Members were informed that other developments were within different areas within the village. It was at their discretion to give certain weight to any harm and benefits.

- That the Conservation Officer had reflected the possible impacts on existing heritage once the reserved matters application had been submitted.
- Concern was raised on Highways and amenities of existing residents with an increased number of cars accessing the driveway immediately adjacent to the site.
- One Member felt the condition around the great crested newts could be strengthened and how the condition would protect the species.

The Planning Officer clarified the Committee were considering the principle of development and access. There was no harm in relation to the development at present. A level of impact had been acknowledged with vehicles travelling up the access route; however, it was not considered to be unacceptable in terms of noise and light pollution.

Licensing measures would cover protection of the great crested newts and would be controlled by legislation. Any works would not be able to proceed until this mitigation was in place.

- Clarification was sought around the potential native impact and harm on Stubton Hall in terms of the setting and character.

The Planning Officer and Conservation Officer had assessed the immediate impact on the asset. There was likely to be an impact, however, the Conservation Officer could not assess the amount of impact at this stage as the details of the development were not part of this application.

- One Member raised the 25% increase of homes in the village in line with the NPPF. It was queried how many houses this represented.

The Principal Development Management Planner clarified through the Council's Local Plan, the Council should identify a minimum of 10% of its supply for small sites of no more than one hectare. The reference within the NPPF did not reference that the Council should not exceed the capacity within a settlement.

The Development Management and Enforcement Manager confirmed that footnote 7 of the NPPF had the ability to disengage the piece of policy, but only when those elements provide a strong reason for refusing the proposed development. This would need to be supported by strong evidence for refusal.

It was noted that drainage, ecology, Highways and heritage could be conditioned. However, the Committee had raised harms around the characters and appearance of the area.

- One Member discussed previous applications within the area that had been to appeal and were approved by appeal.
- The negative impact to the two properties either side of the driveway was highlighted.

It was confirmed that the Council's Environmental Protection Team had been consulted on noise and light pollution for the additional traffic on the access driveway.

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to **REFUSE** planning permission for the following reason:

The proposed development would, as a matter of principle, result in a backland form of development that would be contrary to the prevailing form of the existing settlement, resulting in significant harm to the rural character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The identified harm would be contrary to Policy DE1 of the adopted Local Plan, Policy BE2 of the made Stubton Neighbourhood Plan and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The material considerations in this case, including tilted balance and the public benefits associated with the erection of up to 5 dwellings, would not outweigh the identified harm.

16. Application S26/0458

Proposal: Erection of 18no. fixed self-storage units

Location: Secure Self Storage (a1) Ltd, Great North Road, Colsterworth, Lincolnshire, NG33 5JJ

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

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

District Ward Councillor

Councillor David Bellamy (Statement)

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036 and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- Comments received from Colsterworth Parish Council.
- Comments received from Lincolnshire County Council Highways and Sustainable Drainage.
- Comments received from National Highways.
- No comments received from Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue

The following comments were made by public speakers:

- Concern was raised around hours of operation and visiting times to the site. It was felt these should be restricted to daytime.
- That a field to the south of the proposed site was an allocate site given planning permission in 2019 for residential properties.
- That the amenity of residents future and present was paramount.
- The Parish Council were concerned around noise and light causing disturbance at night, which could cause a fear of crime.

During questions to officers and debate, the following comments were made:

- Whether security and the sites proximity to the A1 could be considered.

The Development Management Planner confirmed the boundary treatment, and security gates would remain on site. Users of the site would be given an access code to gain entry to the site. This was the same arrangement as previously.

- Clarification was sought around why the site was seeking planning permission, if it's previous use was a storage site.

It was confirmed the storage structures being proposed to build were operational development and would be block work built with steel cladding.

- One Member sought clarification around a housing estate to the south of the site, the housing estate was not shown on the plans within the reports.

The ordinance survey that the Planning department based their mapping on for reports had not been updated and therefore, did not include this residential development. The Committee were shown visual plans of the housing development. There was already sound mitigation between the housing development and the proposed site, due to noise from the A1.

- It was suggested whether hours of operation, noise and access could be conditioned, given the residential development nearby.

The site had an existing lawful development certificate which confirms its existing lawful use meaning it was unrestricted as a self-store site, with 24/7 operation. The site had been a lawful storage site since 2002, where the outline planning application would have previously assessed noise mitigation.

- One Member felt the proposed site would encroach onto the residential development running parallel.

- A query was raised on whether there would be a traffic management plan put into place and whether this would provide any safety mechanism for users re-joining the A1.

It was clarified the traffic management plan was for the duration of construction only. Upon completion of the development, National Highways had not requested a permanent traffic management plan.

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to conditions:

Time Limit

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

Reason: In order that the development is commenced in a timely manner, as set out in Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Approved Plans

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

- i. Amended Proposed Site Plan – dwg no. DB/RB/26/238/01 rev A – received 13/04/26
- ii. Proposed Floor and Elevation Plan – dwg no. DB-RB-26-238-02 – received 16/03/26
- iii. Site Location Plan – received 16/03/26

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.

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

Before the development is commenced

3. No part of the development hereby approved shall commence until a Construction Traffic Management Plan has been submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Highway Authority for the A1 Trunk Road). The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the agreed Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Reason: To mitigate any adverse impact from the development on the A1 Trunk Road in accordance with DfT Circular 01/2022

Before the development is occupied

3. Before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied/brought into use, the external elevations shall have been completed using only the materials stated in the planning application forms and approved drawings unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

17. Application S25/2387

Proposal: Change of use of farmyard including demolition of modern farm buildings, conversion of traditional barn to form 1no.dwelling and erection of 4no. residential dwellings with associated infrastructure, erection of detached garages and improvements to existing driveway

Location: Manor Farm, Town Street, Westborough, NG23 5HQ

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

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

Agent	Anthony Northcote – Town Planning (Statement)
-------	--

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Supplementary Planning Document.
- Comments received from Anglian Water Services.
- Comments received from Conservation Officer (SKDC).
- Comments received from Environment Agency.
- Comments received from Environmental Protection Services.
- Comments received from Heritage Lincolnshire.
- Comments received from Lincolnshire County Council - Highways & SuDS.
- Comments received from Tree Officer (SKDC).
- Comments received from Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board.
- Comments received from Westborough Parish Council.

The following comments were made by the public speaker:

- The dairy farming operation will cease with the current milk contract coming to an end on the 31 December 2026. The dairy operation is not

viable when the price being offered for production is only around three-quarters of the actual cost of production. The farmyard will then be completely surplus to requirements.

- In the final proposed layout, the total amount of buildings and hardstanding on the site reduces by over 13% from 4,342m² as the farmyard to 3,767m² with the development.
- Furthermore, in the final proposed layout, the buildings and associated roofscape on the site reduces by over 43% from 2,058m² as the farmyard to 1,167m² with the development.
- The layout retains the orchard as a communal focal point and would result in a net gain in biodiversity of 13.60% of habitat units and 281.32% in hedgerow units which would be provided on-site.
- The proposal will bring the traditional brick barn back into beneficial use, it proposes to recreate part of the historic L shaped layout.
- The overall layout is low-density and is well-spaced out reflecting the character of Westborough. The layout has followed the concept of replacing the five modern farm buildings with four dwellings in the same broad areas thereby keeping the established farmyard layout.
- The layout introduces dedicated car parking for the adjacent bungalow Linford, owned by the applicant which currently has no off-street parking.
- The important green space and the important tree along Town Street are retained and not adversely affected by the proposed development.
- The easternmost farm buildings are outside the Conservation Area and in the proposed layout plots 3 and 4 lie outside the Conservation Area.
- The proposal would deliver much needed housing which would contribute towards the 5-year demonstrable housing land supply. The NPPF in paragraph 73 is clear that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution and looks for Councils to look for 10% of their housing sites to be under 1 hectare in size.

During questions to officers and debate, the following comments were made:

- A query was raised on whether the average number of cars per household for this development would be 3.

The Highway Authority had assessed the application as an active farmyard and the proposal would not cause a highway risk.

- Clarification was sought around the contamination of land outlined in the report. It was queried at what point the assessment of contaminated land would take place.

The Senior Development Management Planning Officer stated that conditions covered the contamination request for verification reports. The reports would need to be submitted and reviewed by the Council's Environmental Protection Team. This would take place pre-commencement to any works on the site.

- Members felt the site was a good use of land. They were pleased to see the orchard would be retained.
- Members requested any hardstanding's be of a porous material.

At present, there was not a drainage condition within the report. Drainage details would have to be submitted to and approved by building regulations.

Condition 11 required the development to be carried out in accordance with the hard and soft landscaping works. It was noted that internal access roads were gravel which would be porous.

It was confirmed that an informative would be included to request any hardstanding's to be of a porous material.

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to conditions:

Time Limit for Commencement

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

Reason: In order that the development is commenced in a timely manner, as set out

in Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Approved Plans

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

Drawing No.717-2024 Location Plan received 9 December 2025

Drawing No.717-2024 100 Rev B Proposed Site Plan received 26 February 2026

Drawing No.717-2024 101 Plot 1 Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans received 9

December 2025

Drawing No.717-2024 102 Plot 2 Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans received 9

December 2025

Drawing No.717-2024 103 Rev A Plot 3 Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans

received 9 December 2025

Drawing No.717-2024 104 Rev B Plot 4 Proposed Floor and Elevation
Plans

received 26 February 2026

Drawing No.717-2024 105 Rev B Plot 5 Proposed Floor and Elevation
Plans

received 26 February 2026

Drawing No.717-2024 106 Rev B Plot 2, 4 and 4 Garages received 26
February

2026

Drawing No.717-2024 107 Rev B Proposed Landscape Plan received
26 February

2026

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.

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

-

Before the Development is Commenced

-

3. Prior to the commencement of development, including any demolition works, the scheme of tree protection measures for the retained trees shall be implemented in accordance with the approved 5837:2002, Tree Protection Plan(s) (TPP) and the recommendations contained within the Tree Survey (Ref P2998/0226/02 issued 16 February 2026, V3) and shall be retained on site as such until the final occupation of the development; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 1 year from the date of the occupation of the final dwelling hereby permitted:

(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 [3998 (Tree Work)].

(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.

Reason: To ensure the trees to be retained will not be damaged during demolition or construction, and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality, in accordance with Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

4. With the exception of the demolition of buildings hereby permitted, Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Phase 2 Intrusive Ground Investigation Scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall detail the risk assessment methodology, sampling, and testing regimes necessary to characterise ground conditions and assess risks to human health, controlled waters, and the wider environment in accordance with current guidance.

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 EN4 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan and NPPF.

5. Prior to the commencement of any works at the site, a written scheme of archaeological investigation for historic building recording shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to provide a reasonable opportunity to record the history of the site and in accordance with Policy EN6 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan and the NPPF (section 16).

6. The building recording works shall be completed in strict accordance with the approved details before development commences.

Reason: In order to provide a reasonable opportunity to record the history of the site and in accordance with Policy EN6 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan and Paragraph 199 of the NPPF.

7. The development shall not commence until a Habitat Management and Monitoring

Plan (the HMMP)], prepared in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan

and including:

a) a non-technical summary;

(b) the roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the

(HMMP)

(c) the planned habitat creation and enhancement work to create or improve habitat

to achieve the biodiversity net gain in accordance with the approved Biodiversity

Gain Plan;

(d) the management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the approved

Biodiversity Gain Plan for a period of 30 years from the completion of development;

(could be occupation) and

(e) the monitoring methodology and frequency in respect of the created or enhanced

habitat to be submitted to the local planning authority, has been submitted to, and

approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in

accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (and

policy EN2).

During Building Works

8. Before any development above damp-proof course, details demonstrating how the proposed dwelling will comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policy SB1 and SD1 must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of how carbon dioxide emissions would be

minimised through the design and construction of the building; details of water efficiency; and the provision of electric car charging points. The approved sustainable building measures shall be completed in full, in accordance with the agreed scheme, prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure the development mitigates and adapts climate change in accordance with Local Plan Policy SB1 and SD1.

9. Before any of the works on the external elevations for the building(s) hereby permitted are begun, samples of the materials (including colour of any render, paintwork or colourwash) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

10. Before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied/brought into use, a verification report confirming that remedial works have been completed shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall have been submitted by the nominated competent person approved, as required by condition above. The report shall include:
- i. A complete record of remediation activities, and data collected as identified in the remediation scheme, to support compliance with agreed remediation objectives;
 - ii. As built drawings of the implemented scheme;
 - iii. Photographs of the remediation works in progress; and

iv. Certificates demonstrating that imported and/or material left in situ is free from

contamination.

The scheme of remediation shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the

approved 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 Policies EN2 and EN4 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan and national

guidance contained in the NPPF paragraphs 196 and 197.

Before the Development is Occupied

-

11. Before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied, all hard and soft

landscaping works shall have been carried out in accordance with the approved

proposed landscape site plan (Drawing No.717_2024_107) Rev B received 26

February 2026.

Reason: Hard landscaping makes an important contribution to the development and

its assimilation with its surroundings and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the

adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

12. Before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied/brought into use,

the external surfaces shall have been completed in accordance with the approved

details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance

with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

Ongoing Conditions

-

13. Monitoring reports shall be submitted to the local planning authority in writing in

accordance with the methodology and frequency specified in the approved (HMMP).

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in

accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (and

policy EN2).

14. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Town and

Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any

order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no building,

enclosure, swimming or other pool or container used for domestic heating purposes

shall be constructed within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse without Planning

Permission first having been granted by 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 DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven

Local Plan.

15. Within a period of five years from the first occupation of the final dwelling/unit of the

development hereby permitted, any trees or plants provided as part of the approved

soft landscaping scheme, that die or become, in the opinion of the Local Planning

Authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced in the first planting

season following any such loss with a specimen of the same size and species as was

approved in condition above unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning

Authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable

standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs and in accordance

with Policies DE1, EN3 and OS1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

16. The created and/or enhanced habitat specified in the approved Habitat Management

Monitoring Plan [HMMP] shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the

approved [HMMP].

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in

accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

17. Notice in writing shall be given to the Council when the Habitat Management and

Monitoring Plan (HMMP) works have started.

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in

accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

18. Application S26/0681

Proposal: Remove conservatory and construct single storey extension to form bedroom and shower room for disabled occupant

Location: 151 Harrowby Lane, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 9LY

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

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036, Design Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- Comments received from Grantham Town Council.
- Comments received from Lincolnshire County Council (Highways and SuDS).

(Councillor Charmaine Morgan declared she was a Member of Grantham Town Council, however, she remained open minded).

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to conditions:

Time Limit for Commencement

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

Reason: In order that the development is commenced in a timely manner, as set out in Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans:

- (a) Application Form – Received 10/07/2025
- (b) Location Plan – Drg No. DFG/151HARROWBY/07 – Received 20/04/26
- (c) Block Plan – Received 20/04/26
- (d) Existing & Proposed Layout Plan – Drg No. DFG/151HARROWBY/01A – Received 20/04/26
- (e) Floor, Roof & Wall Details Plan – Drg No. DFG/151HARROWBY/06 – Received 20/04/26
- (f) Proposed Floor Layout Plan – Drg No. DFG/151HARROWBY/02A – Received 20/04/26
- (g) Proposed Elevation Plan – Drg No. DFG/151HARROWBY/04 – Received 20/04/26
- (h) Proposed Section AA Plan – Drg No. DFG/151HARROWBY/05 – Received 20/04/26

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.

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

- 3) Before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied/brought into use, all external finishes shall have been

completed to match in material, colour, style, bonding and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

(The Committee adjourned at 12:10 and was due to reconvene at 13:00).

19. Application S25/1526

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

Location: Constables Field, Belton Lane, Manthorpe, Grantham

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

Prior to questions to officers and debate, the Chairman reminded the committee that only members present at the previous consideration of the application were eligible to vote on the matter. The following members were eligible to vote, Councillors Pam Byrd, Helen Crawford, Gloria Johnson, Penny Milnes, Charmaine Morgan, Sarah Trotter and Max Sawyer.

During questions to officers and debate, the following comments were made:

- It was commended that the developer had listened to the committee's feedback and the revised application had improved pedestrian access.

Following discussions, it was proposed, seconded, and AGREED to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning and Growth to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions:

Time Limit for Commencement

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 latter.

Reason: In order that the development is commenced in a timely manner, as set out in Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2 Details of the reserved matters set out below shall have been submitted to the Local

Planning Authority for approval within three years from the date of this permission: i. scale

ii. appearance

iii. landscaping layout

Approval of all reserved matters shall have been 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 in order that the development is commenced in a timely manner, as set out in Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Approved Plans

3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans:

i. Site Location Plan received 15 August 2025

ii. Access as shown on Illustrative Block Plan re. MSP.2033/002
received 19 May
2026

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.

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

Prior to Commencement

4 Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, plans showing the existing

and proposed land levels of the site including site sections, spot heights, contours and the finished floor levels of all buildings with reference to neighbouring properties shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

5 The development shall not commence until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (the HMMP)], prepared in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan and including:

- a) a non-technical summary;
- (b) the roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the (HMMP)
- (c) the planned habitat creation and enhancement works to create or improve habitat to achieve the biodiversity net gain in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan;
- (d) the management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan for a period of 30 years from the completion of development; and
- (e) the monitoring methodology and frequency in respect of the created or enhanced habitat to be submitted to the local planning authority, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (and policy EN2).

During Building Works

6 The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with a

Construction Management Plan and Method Statement that shall first be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan and Statement shall indicate measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of vehicle activity and the means to manage the drainage of the site during the construction stage of the permitted development. It shall include:-

- the on-site parking of all vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- the on-site loading and unloading of all plant and materials;
- the on-site storage of all plant and materials used in constructing the development; - wheel washing facilities;
- the routes of construction traffic to and from the site including any off-site routes for the disposal of excavated material and;
- strategy stating how surface water run off on and from the development will be managed during construction and protection measures for any sustainable drainage features. This should include drawing(s) showing how the drainage systems

(temporary or permanent) connect to an outfall (temporary or permanent) during construction.

Construction works would be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Reason: In the interests of the safety and free passage of those using the adjacent public highway and to ensure that the permitted development is adequately drained without creating or increasing flood risk to land or property adjacent to, or downstream of, the permitted development during construction

- 7 No development above damp-proof course shall take place until details demonstrating how the proposed dwellings would comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policy SB1 and SD1 must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of how carbon dioxide emissions would be minimised through the design and construction of the building; details of water efficiency. The approved sustainable building measures shall be completed in full, in accordance with the agreed scheme, prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure the development mitigates and adapts climate change in accordance with Local Plan Policy SB1 and SD1

Prior to the development being occupied

- 8 Before any building/dwelling hereby permitted is occupied/brought into use, the

finished floor levels for that building shall have been constructed in accordance with the approved land levels details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

- 9 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied before a 2-metre-wide footway, to connect the development to the existing footway network, has been provided in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details should be broadly in accordance with Footway Provision Plan re. MSP.2033/001 received 13 April 2026. The works shall also include appropriate arrangements for the management of surface water run-off from the highway.

Reason: To ensure the provision of safe and adequate pedestrian access to the permitted development, without increasing flood risk to the highway and adjacent land and property.

10 Prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted, 1 bird box and 1 bat box shall have been installed for each dwelling.

Reason: To support biodiversity provision on site in line with Policy EN2 of the SKDC Local Plan.

Ongoing Conditions

11 This permission relates to a maximum of 7 dwellings on the site. Reason: To define the permission and for the avoidance of doubt.

12 Notice in writing shall be given to the Council when the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) works have started.

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

13 The created and/or enhanced habitat specified in the approved Habitat Management Monitoring Plan [HMMP] shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved [HMMP].

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

14 Monitoring reports shall be submitted to the local planning authority in writing in

accordance with the methodology and frequency specified in the approved (HMMP). Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (and policy EN2).

20. Application S24/2218

Proposal: Section 73 application to remove Condition 21 (Pennine Way Bridge) and vary Condition 36 (Off-site highways works) of planning

permission S08/1231 to remove the obligation to deliver the Pennine Way bridge

Location: Poplar Farm, Grantham

Recommendation: To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning and Growth to refer the application to the Secretary of State with a resolution to REFUSE planning permission; and In the event that the Secretary of State does not call-in the application, the Assistant Director – Planning and Growth is authorised to REFUSE planning permission.

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

District Ward Councillor

Cllr Matt Bailey

Cllr Gareth Knight

Cllr Paul Martin

Against

Dr James Henshall

On behalf of Applicant

Stuart Bizley (SMB Property
Consultancy Ltd)

Prior to questions to officers and debate, the Chairman reminded the committee that only members present at the previous consideration of the application were eligible to vote on the matter. The following members were eligible to vote, Councillors Pam Byrd, Helen Crawford, Gloria Johnson, and Penny Milnes.

The following comments were made by the public speakers:

- A speaker disputed the necessity to refer the matter to the Secretary of State were the planning permission to be refused.
- A speaker suggested that the letter released by the developer responding to the decision previously made by the committee that the bridge was still necessary, was just a smokescreen to avoid building the bridge. He also highlighted that the letter contradicted the financial position of the developer that was presented during the March Planning Committee meeting.
- It was argued that there had been a lack of transparency for residents throughout the application process and that a potential contested appeal would negatively impact the community. With this in mind, they suggested holding a public meeting with officers in attendance.
- Were it to become necessary to re-negotiate the Section 106 agreement, a speaker suggested including the Norfolk Homes Express Provision Clause, introducing a backstop date halting all further property sales across the site if the deadline is breached, and requiring the developer to place the estimated bridge construction costs into a bond account or parent company. The speaker argued that the clause should allow step-in rights for SKDC to access these funds should the bridge not be built by the deadline.
- A different speaker argued that the report did not present a balanced view as the officer reports in March and May had indicated the bridge was desirable but not necessary. The speaker highlighted that there

had been objections to the reduction in Section 106 contributions and that connectability was not prejudiced by not building the bridge.

During questions to public speakers, the following comments were made:

- The Assistant Director – Planning and Growth confirmed that failure to refer a refusal of the application to the Secretary of State would risk Judicial Review.
- The applicant's agent argued that the bridge was no longer necessary given the change in traffic, the concurring views of Lincolnshire County Council and Highways, and it was not required within SKDC's Transport Strategy. The agent declined to comment on the financial wellbeing of the applicant.

During questions to officers and debate, the following comments were made:

- It was queried and confirmed that the implications of judicial review would be the costs of defending the decision, the costs of the applicant, and the committee would be required to reconsider the decision.
- A member believed that referring to the Secretary of State was due process and it was confirmed that were the decision to be called-in by the Secretary of State then there would be the opportunity to present further evidence.
- There was some support for holding a public forum to give residents the opportunity to engage and understand the process. The Chairman agreed to discuss the matter with the Cabinet Member for Planning.

Following discussions, it was proposed, seconded, and AGREED to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning and Growth to refer the application to the Secretary of State with a resolution to REFUSE planning permission; and In the event that the Secretary of State did not call-in the application, the Assistant Director – Planning and Growth was authorised to REFUSE planning permission for the following reasons:

(1) The removal of the obligation to deliver the Pennine Way Link Road bridge would significantly and demonstrably undermine permeability and active travel connectivity between the site and the surrounding area, without a suitable alternative point of connection. This would result in harm to the permeability of the development and the attractiveness and safety of active travel options, contrary to the principles of Building for a Healthy Life, and as a result conflicts with Policy DE1 and ID2 of the adopted Local Plan, the adopted Design Guidelines SPD and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The material considerations in this case, including the public benefits associated with the delivery of housing, would not outweigh the identified harms and the conflict with the Development Plan.

(2) The Applicant has failed to enter in a planning obligation to secure the necessary affordable housing, open space, healthcare, education and highways contributions required to mitigate the impact of the development on

local infrastructure, as required by Policy ID1, H2, OS1 and ID2 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan 2011-2036

(3) The time limit for the submission of reserved matters has lapsed and all reserved matters relating to the development have been granted under the outline planning permission. As such, the Section 73 permission is incapable of implementation.

21. Application S26/0956

Councillor Max Sawyer declared that he was pre-determined about the application and left the chamber.

Proposal: Submission of details pursuant to Requirement 6 – (Detailed design approval) for Phase 2 Main Construction Works in relation to The Mallard Pass Solar Farm Order 2024 No. 796

Location: Mallard Pass Solar Farm Ltd

Recommendation: That the Committee endorse the draft response to Mallard Pass Solar Farm Ltd and delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Planning & Growth, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, to issue the final response and determine the Requirement 6 submission.

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

District Ward Councillor	Cllr Vanessa Smith (Statement)
Against	Sue Holloway (Mallard Pass Action Group)
Applicant	Catherine Martin (Answer questions only)

The following comments were made by the public speakers:

- Whilst recognising the importance of renewable energy, one speaker argued that proposals caused a flood risk and great disruption by diverting construction traffic along the A15 between Deeping and Bourne during potential works.
- It was suggested that technological improvements over time should result in a smaller solar footprint on the site.
- A speaker argued that the detail publicly available about the application plans was insufficient.

During questions to public speakers, Members commented on the following:

- It was confirmed that the applicant was reviewing the use of technologically new solar panels and had liaised with the parish council about the concerns of local residents.

During questions to officers and debate, the following comments were made:

- It was suggested that any proposals should be suitable to allow for wild animals on the site and consideration should be given to sheep grazing on the site.

- At the request of a member, it was confirmed that comments would be sought from a Lincolnshire Crime Officer about the proposals.
- Given there were no proposals to include battery storage anywhere on the site the fire risk was deemed to be lower, however, the Planning Officer agreed to consider whether feedback from the Fire & Rescue Service would be necessary.
- A member reiterated concerns that the proposals would impact local flood risk, drainage, and surface water run-off.

Following discussions, it was proposed, seconded, and AGREED that the Committee endorsed the draft response to Mallard Pass Solar Farm Ltd and delegated authority to the Assistant Director of Planning & Growth, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, to issue the final response and determine the Requirement 6 submission, in keeping with the comments expressed during questions to officers and debate:

‘SKDC Planning Committee note that, for the purposes of Requirement 6, the submitted Phase 2 detailed design is considered to accord with the approved design guidance and parameter limits secured through the Mallard Pass Solar Farm DCO. The submitted information provides sufficient detail in relation to layout, scale, levels, materials, access arrangements and associated infrastructure, and acknowledge that the principle, extent and overall generating capacity of the development are matters already established through the DCO process. However, formal approval should remain dependent on ensuring consistency with the related requirement submissions, particularly Requirements 7, 8, 9 and 10 relating to landscape and ecology, fencing, drainage and archaeology, where those details remain outstanding and subject to separate approval.

The Committee further requests that the developer gives careful consideration to the matters raised through consultation, particularly the concerns of MPAG, Greatford Parish Council and Braceborough and Wilsthorpe Parish Council. In particular, the Committee urges the developer to continue to explore options to utilise the best available technology to ensure that the scheme makes an efficient use of land, and to continue to explore opportunities for increased setbacks from affected residential properties where possible.

In relation to the proposed retention of construction passing places on Uffington Lane and other rural lanes, before any final position is reached, the developer should work with the local highway authorities and affected communities to justify whether any passing places need to be retained post-construction, whether their number, size and location can be reduced and whether verges should be reinstated where retention is not necessary. This should have regard to potential effects on rural character, rat-running, HGV use, fly-tipping, cyclists, horse riders and local amenity. The applicant should also provide clarification already requested by Officers on substation screening, cable installation impacts, interpretation boards and opportunities to align ecological and flood mitigation measures.

The Committee further seeks clarification on the type of perimeter fencing proposed, noting that this should strike an appropriate balance between addressing concerns regarding rural crime and wildlife, including the local deer population. Comments should also be sought from the Lincolnshire Designing Out Crime Officer on the proposed fencing. In addition, the applicant should provide details regarding the potential for sheep grazing within the site; further explanation regarding flood risk mitigation, particularly in relation to flood risk in Greatford village; and further details of how fire risk concerns have been considered, including the mitigation measures proposed.'

22. Corporate Plan 2024-2027: Key Performance Indicators Report - End-Year (Q4) 2025/26

Councillor Max Sawyer returned to the chamber.

The Corporate Plan 2024-2027: Key Performance Indicators Report - End-Year (Q4) 2025/26 was presented by the Policy Officer.

Appendix A presented the overall performance against the two actions being presented in the session. Commentary by the responsible officer was provided for each action. Performance was summarised using a RAG system as follows:

- One of the actions was rated Green. These were actions which were on or above target as planned.
- Zero actions were rated as Amber, these were those off target by less than 10% or where milestone achievement was delayed but with resolution in place to be achieved within a reasonable timeframe.
- One action was rated as Red. These were actions that were significantly below target.

During discussions, the following comments were made:

- More detail was requested about HOUS10 which was rated as red (below target). It was confirmed that this would be further encapsulated with the upcoming authority monitoring report and a housing supply document would be circulated to the committee. ACTION
- Officers did not have details to hand about a national comparison regarding the Council's five year housing land supply but noted that stock data was subject to fluctuation and many authorities were in the same position following the change in calculation methodology in 2024.

The Corporate Plan 2024-2027: Key Performance Indicators Report - End-Year (Q4) 2025/26 was noted by the committee.

23. Any other business, which the Chairman, by reason of special circumstances, decides is urgent

There were none.

24. Close of meeting

The Chairman closed the meeting at 14:52.