

S25/1526

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

Site Address: Constables Field, Belton Lane, Manthorpe, Grantham

Conditions

The wording to condition 11 within the conditions schedule has been updated as below, for the avoidance of doubt in restricting the number of dwellings on the site.

Amended Condition

11) No more than a maximum of 7 dwellings shall be permitted on this site.

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

Appendix 1 – G Senior

I live at Ellary House in Stubton and I object to this application.

The decision on this application is to be determined by the 'tilted balance' in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

NPPF clause 11(d)(ii) states that applications should be refused if the adverse impacts significantly outweigh the benefits. The tilted balance is exactly what it says - a balance with a preload applied to one side. The harm that this development would cause sits on the other side of the scale. There are numerous adverse impacts that clearly tip the balance the other way.

5 new homes would represent a tiny 0.03% of SKDC's housing target, yet the harm caused to our small rural village would be significant and irreversible. The following adverse impacts are all referred to in the policies in the NPPF and are relevant in considering the balance.

- 1) Stubton is a small rural village with no facilities and no scheduled public transport. It is not a sustainable location.
- 2) Great crested newts are present on site and in the adjacent pond, and their habitat would be damaged.
- 3) There is no significant demand for housing in Stubton.
- 4) Drainage infrastructure in the village is either at capacity or non-existent. Soakaways in the heavy clay are ineffective and could result in flooding on adjacent land. This should be addressed now rather than conditioned.
- 5) There would be a massive detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbours in terms of loss of privacy, overlooking and noise and light pollution.
- 6) The site has only ever been used as equestrian and for grazing horses and sheep. The proposal is backland development that would result in an unacceptable encroachment of buildings into the open countryside and green space. It would significantly damage the landscape character of the village's immediate environs.
- 7) This proposal, together with other recent approvals, would represent a 28% increase in the size of the village. This is disproportionately large and would destroy the nature and character of the village and its attractive rural setting.

The NPPF states that "planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment". This application is clearly at odds with that requirement.

The adverse impacts of approving this application significantly outweigh the benefit of the tiny contribution to SKDC's housing target. It would result in unacceptable and irreversible harm. I would ask the councillors to refuse the application.

Appendix 2 – H Wilson

Good morning

I am unfortunately unable to attend the meeting as I am on holiday in Cornwall and it is just too far to return.

I have made a formal objection to this planning application on the basis that it fails on numerous existing planning conditions.

We are continually being told that the tilted balance overrides normal planning restrictions and decision making. However, when does the tilted balance become the breakdown of all normal criteria and decision making for Committees like yourselves and for the Planning Officers who make recommendations to you. This is the third application within the last two years in Stubton the previous two having been granted, one after refusal by yourselves but the tilted balance came into play on Appeal.

This application for 5 further houses, which again fails on so many existing planning rules, would mean that in the last 3 or 4 years, 17 properties will have been built in Stubton which is a small rural village with no amenities other than a Church and Village Hall.

Have we reached the point where the Government of the day takes over the decision making from afar, bearing in mind that their local knowledge and appreciation of the rural villages being affected, is zero. The Planning Authorities like yourselves are the safeguards of democracy in this respect. You understand the area and have put together your Framework with your local knowledge. You are fighting for your own recognition and for democracy overall. rather than being told from afar by those who do not understand your area. You are also striving to uphold the rules and constraints you have introduced, in good faith, to best serve the community in which you live. Therefore, what is the point of these meetings if you allow yourselves to be so bound by constraints issued by others that you are unable to properly consider how the negative effects and harm of an application to the village in question, significantly outweigh the benefits as is the case with Stubton. I ask you to take the future of rural communities like Stubton into account when making your decision. Thank you.

Hugh Wilson

Home Farm

Stubton

Appendix 3 – R Thornton

Good morning

I understand all speaking slots have been allocated and that this can now only be added to the Planning Committee members information packs.

I would simply state that I do not habitually object to Planning Applications and indeed didn't for either of the recent ones approved in Stubton, despite the fact that I will now overlook an indicative nine new houses. My point is that this application will potentially add a further five houses to a tiny village (less than 80 houses). Given the application fails against so many criteria, surely the 'tilted balance' should be just that - a balance and not a policy of allowing any number of houses to be built in tiny communities that have already absorbed more than their fair share of the new housing burden.

Thank you for your time and attention regarding this.

Regards

Rob Thornton

Doddington Lane

Stubton