

Minutes

Planning Committee

Thursday, 25 September 2025, 1.00 pm

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



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL

Committee Members present

Councillor Charmaine Morgan (Chairman)
Councillor Penny Milnes (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor David Bellamy
Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing
Councillor Pam Byrd
Councillor Paul Fellows
Councillor Vanessa Smith
Councillor Sarah Trotter
Councillor Paul Wood
Councillor Max Sawyer

Cabinet Members present

Councillor Phil Dilks (Cabinet Member for Planning)

Other Members present

Councillor Ian Stokes

Officers

Emma Whittaker (Assistant Director of Planning and Growth)
Phil Jordan (Development Management & Enforcement Manager)
Adam Murray (Principal Development Management Planner)
Kevin Cartwright (Senior Planning Officer)
Hannah Noutch (Development Management Planner)
James Welbourn (Democratic Services Manager)
Amy Pryde (Democratic Services Officer)

40. Register of attendance and apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Tim Harrison, Patsy Ellis and Mark Whittington.

Councillor Max Sawyer substituted for Councillor Patsy Ellis.

41. Disclosure of interests

Councillor Penny Milnes disclosed an interest on application S25/1033 and would be speaking as District Ward Councillor only.

42. Minutes of the meeting held on 28 August 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 August 2025 were proposed, seconded and **AGREED** as a correct record.

43. Application S24/2066

Proposal:	Outline planning application for residential development of up to 73 no. dwellings together with open space, landscaping, drainage, and associated works (all matters reserved except means of access)
Location:	Land north of Wilsford Lane, Ancaster
Recommendation:	To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

District Ward Councillor
Planning Agent

Cllr Ian Stokes
James Stone and Bill Lilley

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036 and National Planning Policy Framework.
- Comments received from Ancaster Parish Council.
- Comments received from Environmental Protection Services (SKDC)
- Comments received from LCC Highways & SuDS Support
- Comments received from Environment Agency
- Comments received from Anglian Water
- Comments received from Fire Authority
- Comments received from LCC Minerals and Waste
- Comments received from LCC Education
- No comments received from North Kesteven District Council
- Comments received from NHS England
- Comments received from Witham Internal Drainage Board
- Comments received from Heritage Lincolnshire
- Comments received from SKDC Principal Urban Design Officer
- Comments received from Conservation Officer
- Comments received from Historic England
- Comments received from Natural England
- Comments received from Affordable Housing Officer
- Comments received from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Ward Councillor raised a concern regarding the density of the application and road safety relating to a narrowing of the road on the approach to the development site. Concern was also raised regarding access to health care facilities in the village and comment made regarding the poor bus service.

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

- Clarification was sought around the overall density of the proposed site.

The Planning agents confirmed the overall scheme proposed was 11.7 dwellings per hectare. The developable area alone was 30 dwellings per hectare.

- Whether the Applicant could guarantee to meet all 26 conditions proposed.

The Planning Agents had reviewed all conditions proposed and were satisfied all conditions could be met.

- Whether the Applicant's could mitigate concerns raised by Anglian Water on the overflow of potential sewerage.

It was clarified Anglian Water had raised concern on dry weather flow, which was an administrative element of the consent. The effluent quality complying with the quality elements of the consent were not in question.

- It was noted that Anglian Water had previously objected to an application for a site opposite when a previous submission was made half the size of the proposed application site.

Back in 2020, Anglian Water objected to a nearby development (Bellway) on the basis of lack of capacity, however, the Bellway development had gone ahead. The quality coming out of works would indicate that significant additional spare capacity in terms of effluent capacity.

- How the Applicant's would manage the site and open space was queried.

A site management company in perpetuity would manage the site and open indefinitely.

- Clarification was sought on the plan. It was queried whether there was a decorative pond or an attenuation pond on site and the proposed depth of it.

The indicative plan showed the pond which was proposed to contain water in times of high rainfall but at other times of the year, it would remain dry. The pond would allow infiltration at a sustainable rate including 40% allowance for climate change. Final plan details including maximum depth would come through at reserve matters stage alongside landscaping measures for safety.

- Further concern was raised on the flow of water in relation to the permit and possibly posing an unacceptable risk to the receiving water course.

Anglian Water's concern was that they may have to submit an application to increase the dry weather flow permit within the consent. All flows going into the works were treated and discharged and treated as effluent.

The Assistant Director of Planning and Growth confirmed that water authorities were governed by different regulations. Whilst not statutory consultees, at planning application stage, the Council were encouraged to consult with them.

Committee members were advised that condition 4 in the report required a scheme for dealing with foul drainage prior to commencement. Condition 27 on the supplement required the foul drainage scheme to be implemented before any occupation on site.

- The proximity from the site to the nearby quarry was queried. It was noted that noise from the quarry had been mitigated by a barrier.
- It was queried whether an airborne articulate and dust survey had taken place in terms of the impact of the quarry on potential residents on the proposed site.

As part of the application, the Applicant's had liaised with the Council's Environmental Health team on noise. The Applicant's were required to demonstrate that the proposed application would not affect the current operation of the quarry, this had been demonstrated by an acoustic barrier. The Environmental Health Officer had no objection to scheme in regard to noise or dust.

The location of the site had been located within the Local Plan as a developable land suitable for houses.

- Further information was requested on the distance from the quarry to the nearest proposed house.
- One Member requested further details on the acoustic fence and whether it would be landscaped.

The acoustic fence design specifications would be dealt with by the discharge of condition applications. In terms of landscaping, the acoustic fence could go behind vegetation at reserve matters application.

It was confirmed there was approximately 80 meters from the quarry to the closest house to the site.

(The Committee adjourned for 5 minutes to consider the additional information report).

During questions to officers and debate, Members commented on the following:

The Senior Planning Officer clarified that condition 12 required a submission of the landscape and ecology management plan which would deal with management responsibilities. The plan would also be part of any S106 agreements in the form of securing the open space (informal and formal) and ensure ongoing management.

The affordable housing provision for the site was proposed at 30%.

- Concern was raised that a condition related to approved details, as these had not been submitted by Anglian Water.

A condition within the report required the submission of foul drainage details, with a further condition to ensure the development is undertaken in accordance with those details.

- Members raised their disappointment with Anglian Water. It was questioned that if the application be approved, could the Council compel Anglian Water to fulfil their duty to provide their services in a timely manner.

It was confirmed that the Council could not compel Anglian Water to undertake works on the upgrade to the water recycling centre as they were not regulated by the Council. Conditions required the works to be in place before first occupation and safeguards the Council on their duty in ensuring adequate foul water drainage.

- Whether conditions related to surface water management prior to occupation of the site.

Conditions related to prior any commencement on the site which included surface water. Other conditions related to prior any occupation of the site.

- Further concern was raised on dust.
- A query was raised on when the plan was included within the Council's Local Plan.

The Council's Environmental Health team had reviewed the application in its entirety alongside the relationship to the operational quarry. There had been concerns of noise, which was conditioned to be mitigated, however, there had been no concerns on dust.

- Concern was raised on the bund. It was queried whether the bund could be disguised due to sensitive views either side of it.

There was extensive existing trees and hedgerows running along the main road. Plans indicated the majority of this would be retained apart from the site access. There was limited views into the site due to the existing boundary treatments and conditioned noise attenuation. Landscaping and boundary treatments would be discussed at reserve matters. The requirement to landscape either side of the bund could be considered then.

Final Decision:

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement

(Councillor Vanessa Smith voted against the proposal).

44. Application S25/1033

(Councillor Penny Milnes removed herself from the Committee, due to speaking in objection to the application).

Proposal: Outline application for up to 4 detached dwellings.
All matters reserved except access.

Location: Land West Of Doddington Lane, Stubton, NG23
5BX

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 Penny Milnes
Stubton Parish Council	Jackie Britten-Crooks
Submitting Agent	Nick Grace – GraceMachin Planning & Property

Together with:

- No comment received from Ward Councillor.
- Comments received from Parish Council.
- Comments received from Highways.
- Comments received from Conservation Officer.
- Comments received from Heritage Lincolnshire.

The Parish Councillor spoke and stated historically the ridge and furrow had been protected and maintained by local farmers. They emphasized the content of the Neighbourhood Plan and landscape assessment referring to NE2.

The Ward Councillor stated that Stubton was a small village. The site was distinguished as being a non-designated heritage asset being an excellent example of ridge and furrow listed in the Lincolnshire historic environment record. An aerial photograph provided by the speaker illustrated the existing ridge and furrow.

The speaker stated that Stubton Neighbourhood plan and landscape character assessment indicated the importance of ridge and furrow to the setting of the village and importance of retaining a high quality environment.

They also stated that the ridge and furrow was undisturbed pasture with improved soil quality and water management on heavy clay. They stated the biodiversity of the site is unique.

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

- Whether Stubton had a wide range of amenities for the amount of residents who live there.

The Ward Councillor confirmed Stubton was classed as a small village due to having a small village hall.

- Clarification was sought around local support; however, the report did not outline any evidence of local support.

The submitting agent clarified that the report included '9 letters of comment' submitted within the application, with 7 in favour and none against the application.

- Whether the Applicant had considered other areas for this development wouldn't affect a non-designated site and heritage.

It was confirmed that no other sites had been explored as this was the only site purchased by the landowner within the village.

In relation to heritage, Stubton had several large areas of ridge and furrow. The decision making needed to be based upon the need to supply housing balanced against the harm of the small area of ridge and furrow among larger areas around Stubton.

- Biodiversity net gain was discussed from the proposal. It was noted that the site currently had ancient meadows which were some of the most biodiverse in the country. Clarification was sought how the removal of ancient meadows would increase biodiversity.

The submitting agent had worked with an ecologist and a PEA (Preliminary Ecological Proposal) had been undertaken and a biodiversity metric had been prepared based upon an index profession study of the site. There would also be a 16.67% improvement of hedgerows.

The Principal Development Management Planner confirmed the agricultural field was a non-designated heritage asset and did not have any statutory protection.

- Clarification was sought that if this application was not passed, whether the owner of the land would be entitled to deep plough the land.

There was no control over what the owner to the land wished to do with the land, if this application was refused.

A comment within the report stated that 'there had been no pre-application community consultation exercise carried out and it was therefore not clearly evidenced that there was substantial support from the local community project'.

The submitting agent highlighted that a planning strategy was established for this site. The Applicant felt the best way for them to engage with the local community was through the Parish Council.

The Development Management Planner clarified that in terms of policy SP4 and community support, there had been no prior community consultation exercise submitted. Within the representations section of the report, there were 7 letters of support and 2 neutral letters.

Officers had assessed this information but limited weight could be given to the community support criteria of Policy SP4 due to the 5 year housing land supply shortage.

- Clarification was sought on whether the Applicant's identified work to deliver the biodiversity net gain would create more ecofriendly environment than currently.

It was confirmed the application would provide a positive biodiversity improvement over the existing level.

During questions to officers and debate, Members commented on the following:

- Clarification was sought around the proposed site and boundary of the ridge and furrow area alongside proposed hedging.

It was clarified a further survey take place at reserved matters stage to provide further details on landscaping details and biodiversity net gain.

Condition 6 specifically dealt with a biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan to be submitted as part of the layout and landscaping reserved matters and should be informed by a new primarily ecological appraisal.

The statutory biodiversity net gain condition also required a minimum 10% net gain over a 30-year period. The condition established a baseline value and distinguished between habitat, hedgerow and watercourse units. The baseline survey on the existing site recognised the existing hedgerow was a high distinctive habitat or hedgerow unit which had to be uplifted by 10% or greater if a hedgerow needed to be removed.

It was proposed, seconded to authorise the Assistant Director - Planning & Growth to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions

- It was noted that if the application be approved, only a small proportion of the ridge and furrow would be protected.

- Members commented on the lack of public consultation and community support.
- Concern was raised on the rural nature of the application.
- A query was raised on plans for flood prevention and surface water.

The Development Management Planner highlighted the application was in flood zone one, therefore, not a major concern for flood risk of surface water. A condition had been drafted for drainage details to be submitted.

- One Member noted that ridge and furrow sites were a form of medieval drainage management.
- The loss of existing mature hedgerow and soil was raised, it was felt it was not easy to replace a hedgerow and soil.

The proposal to approve the application fell.

- A query was raised on what weight should be given to the tilted balance of the housing supply, due to the application proposed being within a smaller village.

The Assistant Director of Planning and Growth informed that the weight given to an application was a matter for the Committee, as decision makers.

- Members reiterated the application was a significant heritage harm, however, recognised the land was a non-designated heritage asset.
- The Committee discussed landscape and impact on the character of the area.
- It was questioned whether the protection of ridge and furrow was stated within the neighbourhood plan.

The neighbourhood plan did not have a specific policy reference to the protection of ridge and furrow, however, supporting text within landscape character mentioned that ridge and furrow was a distinctive feature of landscape character.

Final Decision:

It was proposed, seconded and **REFUSE** the application for the following reason:

The application proposals would result in the total loss of an area of ridge and furrow, which is defined as a non-designated heritage asset and is recognised as a key character of the rural landscape character identified in the made Stubton Neighbourhood Plan. As a result, the application proposals would result in substantial harm to the significance of a non-designated heritage asset and the public benefits of the scheme, including the provision of housing, which is identified as a significant benefit, would not outweigh the identified harm, due to the limited weight attributed to the provision of 4 dwellings. As such, the application proposals are contrary to Policy EN6 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan 2011-2036 (Adopted January 2020), Policy nE2 of the Stubton Neighbourhood Plan and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The development proposed would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole, and material considerations are insufficient to indicate that the decision should be otherwise than in accordance with it, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the Framework.

(The Committee had a 20 minute adjournment).

45. Application S24/0568

(Councillor David Bellamy removed himself from the Committee, due to speaking in objection to the application).

Proposal: Erection of an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility and carbon capture, improvement of existing and part creation of new access track, landscaping and other associated infrastructure

Location: Development East of Sewstern Industrial Estate, South of Sewstern Road, Gunby

Recommendation: To review the updated evidence submitted as part of the appeal and the position in defending the appeal

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

District Ward Councillor:	Councillor David Bellamy
Colsterworth, Stainby and Gunby Parish Council	Rebecca Chatterton
Against:	Vanessa Tombs (Community Action Group)
	Gary Toogood
	Janine Liladhar

The Ward Councillor commented on the scale of the development and whether it was appropriate development in open countryside. He stated it may not comply with policies E7 and SP5. He challenged the rural location in open countryside of the industrial site.

The Parish council representative stated the parish council view is that the reasons for refusal have not changed and asked the committee to keep to the decision to refuse. There was a challenge to the highways evidence provided by the applicant and LCC Highways. A concern was raised regarding the cumulative increased HGV traffic in the area in harvest time. The decision to locate the site in its rural position was challenged and consequential impact on the amenity of residents of the villages including dust and noise.

A speaker from BLOCK Action Group also stated that the site is incorrect for an industrial site and has called for Rule 6 status at the Public Enquiry and stated the officer report lacked analysis. LCC Highways report considers capacity and safety and other impacts had not been included. Leicestershire Highways had not identified a change in the highways report. New data collected when the B676 was

closed to traffic. An independent expert had identified reasons for refusal. It is felt concerns raised regarding the impact on amenity and biodiversity had not been addressed. BLOCK considered that the new proposal did not overcome the original reasons for refusal.

Another public speaker had a farming background. He stated the significant use of crops for energy production would impact on food security. The application would extend the industrial area into the countryside, contrary to DE1 and EN1. He stated he was a retired member of the Institute of Highways Engineers and qualified Road Safety Auditor and raised the lack of a Road Safety plan. He also challenged the data collection. He queried the noise survey which did not cover the access road noise which could reach 90decibels and is above standard. Poor road surface conditions would also impact on the noise levels.

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

- A query was raised on whether the traffic plan had been scuritrised by any members of the community.

The representative of Colsterworth, Stainby and Gunby Parish Council confirmed a community group called 'BLOCK' and the Parish Council had been working together to provide a further traffic assessment.

- One Member sought further clarification over a public speaker who had relevant qualifications, was previously a member of the Institute of Highways Engineers and qualified in road safety audits.
- Further information was requested on what receptors and decibel levels were of concern in the area.

The Public Speaker clarified the access farm track would produce noise with a one HGV traveling down the track every 10 minutes. It was noted that an empty trailer can cause a reverberation noise that can be around a 90-decibel range which could be heard from a fair distance away. He stated that a lack of landscaping or banking will help reduce noise. He stated the long track must have passing places

- A query was raised on whether the survey included noise and reverberations of an empty lorry and a loaded lorry.

The survey dealt with DMRB (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) meaning motorways and major roads. The B676 was not a motorway or major road and therefore, the public speaker felt as if the information was not collected correctly due to a road closure.

It was highlighted that loaded lorries had a lower suspension noise and road noise as opposed to the echoing panels of the unstressed side of an empty lorry.

It was further clarified the noise would travel a significant distance. The start of the track was close to Stainby and many residents in Stainby would hear the noise.

- Whether there was a difference between covered and uncovered HGV's in relation to noise.

All HGV's had to be covered by law, where it be by tarpaulin.

- One Member requested specific information on comments made by a Public Speaker that the appeal was 'error-ridden'.

The Public Speaker raised several concerns of the appeal and outlined the following:

- 20 letters posted to Inspectorate
- No mention of traffic or local
- Pistenbully noise and the number of them proposed to be used on site

The Public Speaker noted there was an existing storage place in Garthorpe and Garthorpe residents had not been consulted. Permission had been granted in January 2025 by Melton Mowbray Council to take stock from the fields and to and from the biogas site.

- Concern was raised regarding the bus. The Applicant's had confirmed any construction staff could use a bus to access the proposed site, however, the first bus that left Melton Mowbray in the morning was 10:10am, arrived at Buckminster at 10:30am and then would have a 30 minute walk to the biogas site. The last bus back to Melton Mowbray was 11:50am.

*(It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to extend the meeting until 17:30)*

Exclusion of public and press:

Under section 100(a) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public were excluded from the meeting during any listed item of business on the grounds that if it were to be present, exempt information could be disclosed to them as defined in the relevant paragraph of schedule 12a of the Act.

*(It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to go into closed session, for the Committee to receive legal advice).*

The meeting resumed in open session at 17:25.

Final Decision:

Option 3: In light of the new further evidence, amendments and changes to the Highways evidence and proposal put before us, the Committee had resolved not to contest the appeal in respect of the previously stated reasons for refusal. However, the Council will query the legal adequacy of the environmental statement to the Planning Inspectorate due to the failure to appropriately assess the indirect effects

of the production of the digestate resulting from the development as required by the case.

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

There were none.

47. Close of meeting

The Chairman closed the meeting at 17:26.

This page is intentionally left blank