



SOUTH  
KESTEVEN  
DISTRICT  
COUNCIL

## **Additional Information Report**

This report sets out additional information in relation to planning applications for consideration at the Planning Committee on 14 May 2026 that was received after the Agenda was published.

### **Agenda Item 7**

#### **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

**Site Address:** Poplar Farm, Grantham

#### **Officer Advice to Members**

Following publication of the main Committee Report, it is noted that comments received from Councillors have expressed concerns about the approach taken within the viability assessment. In particular, it has been suggested that the viability study is flawed because it is based solely on 880 dwellings proposed to be built on the remainder of the site and not the full 1,800 dwellings approved as part of the outline consent. In addition, it stated that the viability study fails to consider any developer profit gained from the 677 dwellings completed to date on the site, which should be accounted for in assessing whether the development in full could viably afford the delivery of the bridge.

In respect of the above, Members are reminded that the published Viability Assessment has been completed by an independent viability consultant appointed on behalf of the Council. The viability assessment has been completed in accordance with the professional guidance, including the planning practice guidance.

With regards to the specific concerns raised, firstly, it should be noted that the viability assessment presents a best-case scenario for the development. The assessment accounts for 880 dwellings being completed across the remainder of the site, which is 243 dwellings fewer than the capacity permitted by the extant planning permission, because this is the maximum quantum of development which is considered to be capable of being appropriately delivered on the site. In order to deliver the full balance of the outline permission i.e. to deliver a scheme of 1,123 dwellings, this would require a development at a density which would not be appropriate for the character of the area, and would require a housing mix that would be disproportionately focused on smaller dwellings and / or of a scale which would not be appropriate for the area.

In addition, whilst the viability study assesses whether the development could afford the bridge on the basis of 880 dwellings to be delivered on the remainder of the site, it is understood that the delivery of the bridge would require a further reduction in the number of dwellings to be delivered. As such, the gross development value would be lower than the position presented within the viability study, thus likely to result in a greater viability deficit than that presented within the study.

Similarly, the viability study currently permits for the payment to Network Rail for the right to deliver the bridge to account for 33% of the land value. However, the viability consultant has advised that it is possible that this payment could be up to 50% of the land value. As such, the costs accounted for within the viability study are also presented on a best-case scenario.

With regards to whether the viability study should account for any profit obtained from the 677 dwellings completed to date, it should be noted that viability studies should include a reasonable profit/premium for landowners in order to reflect the minimum return at which it is considerable reasonable that a landowner would be willing to sell the land. In this case, the viability study allows for a 17.5% profit, which is consistent with the approach adopted within the Council's Whole Plan Viability Assessment (January 2024).

Nonetheless, whether the viability study should account for any additional profit/premium obtained by the landowner in the earlier phases, it is the viability consultant's position that this approach would not be practical. In particular, they have advised that it would not be possible to access accurate historic costs and values for the completed phases of the site. Similarly, even if it could be possible to obtain information relating to the purchase price paid for the respective parcels, it would not be possible to accurately determine whether this included any "excess profit" which should be accounted for in any consideration as to whether the development could afford to deliver the bridge.

In this context, the appropriate manner in which to assess whether the bridge can be viably delivered, is to assess whether it can be funded from the remainder of the development.

As such, the recommendation to Committee remains as per the original report.

## **Agenda Item 8**

### **S25/0024**

**Proposal:** Use of land as glamping site including 3no. ecofriendly glamping pods, utility building, creation of car parking area and associated landscaping

**Site Address:** Land at 8 Bourne Road, Folkingham

- **Additional documents submitted by Applicant:**

“Following the comments received from the Conservation Officer, I have attached a revised Landscape Strategy Plan for the application site, which seeks to provide further clarity regarding the proposed planting, screening, orchard-style landscaping, drainage features, and the overall integration of the development within the landscape.

The revised plan has been updated to reflect:

- Native boundary planting and screening
- Orchard-style planting reflecting the historic use of the site
- Surface water management features including rain gardens and soakaways
- The broader landscape-led approach to the development

I have also attached a short response summary document which addresses a number of the recurring concerns raised through public comments and clarifies how these matters have been addressed through the amended proposal, supporting reports, and consultee responses.

The following summary has been prepared to assist in clarifying and responding to a number of recurring concerns raised through public comments during the application process.

1. PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT / CHANGE TO CHARACTER OF AREA-

The proposal has been significantly reduced from 8 pods to 3 pods in response to feedback.- The development is therefore small-scale and low density in nature.- The proposal represents a modest form of rural tourism accommodation and is not considered a high intensity commercial use.- The majority of the site remains open and undeveloped greenfield land.- The proposal is intended to operate as a quiet, wellbeing-focused retreat rather than a traditional campsite or holiday park.

2. VISUAL IMPACT / HERITAGE / CONSERVATION AREA-

The Conservation Officer has not objected to the proposal.- The Conservation Officer's comments relate to clarification of landscaping and levels rather than identified heritage harm.- A detailed landscape strategy has now been prepared, including: • Native hedgerow screening • Orchard-style planting reflecting the site's historic use • Additional native planting • Landscape-led integration of the development- The pods are positioned so they are not visible from the road, village centre, or conservation area.- The development is low in height and will be further softened through landscaping.- The pods are elevated lightweight structures and do not require traditional foundations.

3. DRAINAGE / FLOOD RISK-

A detailed SuDS and drainage strategy has been prepared by specialist drainage consultants.- Surface water is managed through soakaways and sustainable drainage measures including permeable surfaces and rain gardens.- Further clarification requested by the LLFA has been addressed through additional technical submissions.- No evidence has been identified demonstrating that the site itself is unsafe or incapable of being drained appropriately.- Surface water and foul water are managed separately.- Foul water will be managed via a package treatment plant and drainage field as detailed within the drainage strategy. Planning Committee - Key Response Summary.

4. HIGHWAYS / TRAFFIC IMPACT-  
The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the amended proposal.- The proposal relates to only 3 units and therefore represents a very limited level of vehicle movement.- The scale of the proposal is not considered to result in a severe highways impact.
5. NOISE / AMENITY-  
The proposal is intended to operate as a quiet, low-impact retreat.- It is not intended for parties, events, or large group gatherings.- Environmental Health has raised no objection.- The scale of the proposal (3 pods only) inherently limits activity and intensity of use.
6. FUTURE EXPANSION / "PRECEDENT"-  
The current application relates solely to the 3 pods shown on the submitted plans.- Any future development would require a separate planning application and full assessment by the Local Planning Authority.- Planning applications must be determined on their own individual merits.
7. TYPE OF ACCOMMODATION / "STATIC CARAVAN" COMMENTS-  
The application clearly relates to 3 fixed glamping pod units as shown on the submitted plans.- The proposal being assessed is the development shown within the submitted drawings and supporting information.- References within earlier concept material to yurts or geo-domes do not alter the current proposal before Committee.
8. LANDSCAPING / FOOTPATH EDGE-  
Boundary treatment has been designed to maintain a soft rural edge through native planting.- Screening is intended to filter views naturally rather than create harsh enclosure.- Landscaping has been designed to preserve the rural character of the public footpath while providing appropriate privacy.
9. COMMUNITY SUPPORT-  
Whilst objections have been received, the applicant has also spoken directly with residents who support the proposal and welcome a small-scale addition to the village.- The applicant has responded positively throughout the process and made meaningful amendments to address concerns raised.
10. OVERALL POSITION-  
The proposal has been reduced in scale.- Technical matters have been assessed through professional reports.- Consultees have not identified unacceptable impacts that would justify refusal.- The recommendation from the Planning Officer is approval subject to conditions."

- **An additional document has been received from the Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board.**

Black Sluice has advised that the guidance sheet may apply to the site dependent on surface and treated water discharge. The document provides technical guidance for property owners and developers.

- **Additional condition proposed limiting number of glamping units to a maximum of 3.**

## Officer Advice to Members

Following a further review of the Officer Report, it is considered appropriate to impose a further condition specifying that the number of glamping units should not exceed 3. The addition of this condition is to define the permission and for the avoidance of any doubt. Aside from this addition, should the application be approved, the recommended conditions contained within the main report. would sufficiently and adequately address the points raised by the Applicant and the Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board. The conditions require the submission of details including the submission of a comprehensive landscape management plan and drainage strategy which would be required to be approved in writing prior to the use commencing. The conditions would provide the opportunity for the relevant consultees, through the submission of a details reserved by condition application (discharge of condition), to properly assess details and if acceptable, approve the submitted details through a formal consultation exercise.

The additional condition is as follows:

1. The total number of glamping units to be constructed on the application site shall not exceed 3 in total.

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

As such, the recommendation is as follows:

To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions listed in the main Agenda.

**Financial Implications reviewed by: Not applicable**

**Legal Implications reviewed by: Not applicable**