

# Planning Committee



SOUTH  
KESTEVEN  
DISTRICT  
COUNCIL

---

Thursday, 22 January 2026 at 10.00 am  
Council Chamber - Council Offices,  
St. Peter's Hill, Grantham. NG31 6PZ

---

**Committee Members:** Councillor Charmaine Morgan (Chairman)  
Councillor Penny Milnes (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing, Councillor Pam Byrd, Councillor Helen Crawford,  
Councillor Patsy Ellis, Councillor Paul Fellows, Councillor Tim Harrison,  
Councillor Gloria Johnson, Councillor Vanessa Smith, Councillor Sarah Trotter,  
Councillor Mark Whittington and Councillor Paul Wood

---

## Agenda Supplement

**10. Application S24/2214** (Pages 3 - 5)

**Proposal:** Application for approval of reserved matters relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for the erection of up to 50 dwellings pursuant to outline planning permission S20/0775  
**Location:** Land West of Main Road, Long Bennington  
**Recommendation:** To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to GRANT reserved matters consent, subject to conditions

**11. Application S25/1656** (Pages 7 - 9)

**Proposal:** Planning application for a proposed change of use of a Residential Care Home (Use Class C2) to two 12-bedroom House of Multiple Occupancy (Use Class Sui Generis)  
**Location:** Birchwood Nursing Home, 6 Dudley Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire NG31 9AA  
**Recommendation:** To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions

This page is intentionally left blank



## Additional Information Report

This report sets out additional information in relation to planning applications for consideration at the Planning Committee on 22 January 2026 that was received after the Agenda was published.

### S24/2214

**Proposals:** Application for approval of reserved matters relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for the erection of up to 50 dwellings pursuant to outline planning permission S20/0775

**Site Address:** Land West off Main Road, Long Bennington, Lincolnshire

### Summary of Information Received

A representation has been received from Long Bennington Parish Councillor John Leventhall which is taken in full below:

*I am representing 14 properties of the adjacent housing to this development, on The Pastures and a total of 22 local residents, including myself, and the Parish Council. Whilst broadly supporting the application, we wish to comment in several respects relating to drainage and for the Planning Committee's attention, prior to public speaking in the meeting, which has the additional support of Cllr Paul Wood, unfortunately absent from this meeting. We ask that the committee's support for the investigation and resolution of concerns below is minuted to assist in triggering further action.*

*Whilst it is heartening to see that LCC Highways and Anglian water have approved the drainage arrangements for surface water internal to the site and sewage disposal respectively, with the local knowledge of the residents and Parish Council we feel that there are several critical aspects that may significantly affect the flood safety of the development, and the wider village that have been overlooked or at least not properly dealt with yet by the officials. These are:*

*1) Does Anglian Water realise (despite our concerns previously communicated) that the proposed connection point for the sewage is on Main Road at the end of The Pastures, at a point that is already known to regularly overflow sewage and that The Pastures sewer, that discharges at the same point, are also overloaded, leading to periodic attendance by AW to unblock? Their visiting engineers have certainly commented to residents on this shortfall of capacity. Also, we know of no attention that has been given (even if it has) as to why the sewage is being connected upstream of the development when we have been fairly reliably informed*

on the Parish Council that the main sewer flows downstream along Main Road on the same side. It is the PC's belief that it would be far more sensible to pump the sewage into the sewer lower down towards the south. I suspect the chosen arrangement might simply be the cheapest solution. Can the planner or the planning committee help us bring this to the attention of the developer and AW and get it properly considered?

2) LCC do not appear to have considered whether the condition or capacity of the dyke/ditch along the boundary of the site is able to take the peak overflows of surface water. Also, there is yet no indication of a plan to clear the dyke and ensure it has capacity for 1 in 100-year flood and provision for ongoing maintenance of the dyke in perpetuity. These matters should be conditioned specifically because of the complication of responsibility for maintenance of the outflows all the way to the Ease Drain a considerable distance away. It has not been made clear who has responsibility for the good operation of the dyke to the Ease drain. We presume the developer accepts responsibility for the dyke where it borders the development site. They, AW, LCC and others will then cite that riparian waterway responsibility lies with the owner of the land. It is clear that the adjacent property has not maintained the dyke and the landowner further down that pipework has been laid some time ago for more efficient drainage of those fields making the dyke redundant and maintenance of the dykes an unnecessary expense. Therefore, the dyke protection is likely to be neglected. Something must be done to coordinate the good functioning of the entire watercourse down to the Ease drain. Can SKDC assist to talk to the right people? Can it be conditioned or covenanted somewhere? Might it be adopted by the Internal Drainage Board? Again, assistance from SKDC to resolve these matters is sought.

Could we also support Kevin Cartwright's emphasis that these drainage matters remain as Condition 9 of the related outline application S20/0775 and current application S25/0014 and it is for him to ensure that those conditions are fulfilled. But by virtue of the concern within the local community and consultees about the above aspects, we agree it may be more appropriate that these matters should be brought before the committee for ratification to ensure that the vulnerabilities and gaps in knowledge and/or proper consideration about the drainage outside of the site, that I have raised above, are fully resolved.

Could we also acknowledge the cooperation and knowledgeable assistance that Kevin Cartwright has given the residents group so far.

Finally, in addition to comments submitted in the consultation, we wish to emphasise our concern that the boundary treatment along The Pastures is currently inadequate to ensure proper privacy for both The Pastures residents and those of the development properties. Currently 0.9m mesh fencing is specified, presumably so as not to interfere with the hawthorn hedgerow.



*However, in the autumn, winter and half the spring there is complete visibility through the deciduous, leafless hedge, severely affecting The Pastures and development residents' privacy. We don't think this has been considered by the developer. The Pastures residents wish to have 1.8m close boarded fencing along their border (the same treatment dividing properties over the rest of the site). We do not believe this will have a detrimental effect on the hedgerow. I submit evidence on the left of one property on the Pastures with a short run of 1.8m fence installed because the hedge had little or no foliage below the fence line, allowing full visibility through by walkers and others in the field, adversely affecting privacy. In this section, the hedge has happily grown up and continues to thrive above the fence line. Even with 1.8m fencing installed, The Pastures gardens give access to light and rainfall for the hedgerow on their side. So, we respectfully but vehemently request that 1.8m close boarded fencing should be conditioned as the boundary treatment along the line of The Pastures for the amenity and privacy of both sides.*

### **Officer comments**

The comments of the Parish Council are noted. As per the committee report, the comments in relation to drainage and boundary treatments are the subject of Condition 9 – Drainage and Condition 13 – Boundary Treatments of Outline Planning Permission and are not specific matters for the consideration of this reserved matters submission.

### **Recommendation:**

**To authorise the Assistant Director of Planning to GRANT approval of reserved matters subject to the conditions in the officer report.**

This page is intentionally left blank

## S25/1656

**Proposal:** Planning application for proposed change of use from residential care home (Use Class C2) to 2(no) 12-bedroom Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class Sui Generis)

**Site Address:** Birchwood Nursing Home, 6 Dudley Road, Grantham, NG31 6AA

## Updates to Officer Report

For the avoidance of doubt, it should be noted that the proposed development entails to change of use to 2(no) 12-bedrrrom HMOs together with associated minor operational development. In particular, the proposed change of use would involve following operational development: the alteration to an existing ground floor window; the removal of an area of boundary wall and installation of additional hardstanding to facilitate additional off-street parking; and the installation of bin storage areas and cycle storage area.

Further comments have been received from the Council's Tree Officer and Conservation Officer in relation to these specific elements of the proposal. These are set out as follows:

### SKDC Tree Officer

*'An examination of early 19th-century mapping confirms the longstanding presence of trees within and adjacent to the site, including those located to the rear of neighbouring properties. These features form part of the historic landscape and contribute to the character of the conservation area. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development is likely to result in a noticeable and potentially harmful impact on this established historic setting.'*

*The submitted existing and proposed drawings should be assessed against the requirements of BS 5837:2012, which generally prohibits construction within Root Protection Areas unless it can be robustly justified and no viable alternative layout exists. The photomontages indicate that the proposal may necessitate the removal of protected trees to facilitate the development, including a specimen measured at 7.5 cm diameter at 1.5 m above ground level.*

*The absence of a tree survey represents a significant gap in the submission and prevents a thorough assessment of the proposal's impact on the character and setting of the conservation area. Based solely on the information provided, the development is likely to require the removal of protected trees within the conservation area, with a strong potential to negatively affect its local character and historic value.*

### Recommendations

*Provide a BS 5837:2012-compliant tree survey, including shading analysis, assessment of trees on adjoining properties, and consideration of historical landscape impacts'.*

The SKDC Tree Officer visited the site on the 20<sup>th</sup> January, and provided the following additional comments:

*'I am writing to follow up on my previous comments regarding the site visit. The conservation area mandates the protection of all trees with a diameter of 7.5cm at a height of 1.5m.*

*Upon examining the "scaled existing and proposed" drawing dated September 25, 2025, it is evident that certain trees() are interacting with the proposal for example one large tree appear to be within or immediately adjacent to the footprint of the cycle store, yet not shown on the drawing, is this tree being removed?*

*While I recognize that planning permission supersedes the conservation area notice, it is suggested that adhere to the same standards required for a conservation area notice is reasonable. One of the essential requirements is that all trees must be accurately plotted, and the impacts on them clearly articulated. This critical information appears to be absent from the current documentation'.*

### SKDC Conservation Officer

*'The bin stores proposed are to be located at the sides of the property behind 3no. parking spaces. As such, the visual impact will be minimised by the parked cars. There would be no detrimental impact to the conservation area. Further details regarding the proposed construction and elevations of the bin store would be welcomed. It is assumed that they would be constructed of timber, but it is not confirmed'.*

## **Evaluation**

The comments from the Tree Officer are noted and it is accepted that the submitted drawings do not show all of the existing trees on the site, and similarly that there is currently limited information relating to the potential implications of the proposed bin and cycle storage on these existing trees. Notwithstanding this, it is the Case Officer's assessment that the site is sufficiently large that these storage areas could be reasonably accommodated within the site without having an unacceptable impact on these trees and therefore the character of the area. Nonetheless, further details are required to be secured through planning conditions, which would require final details of the location, appearance, method of construction and any necessary tree protection measures during construction. These conditions could be required to be complied with prior to the erection of these storage areas.

## **Planning 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:
  - i) Site Location Plan, drawing ref. 0113-001 050 01 (received 25/09/25)
  - ii) Proposed Block Plan, drawing ref. 0113-001 051 01 (received 25/09/25)
  - iii) Proposed Floor and Elevation Plan, drawing ref. 0113-001 101 01 (received 25/09/25)

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.

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

### **During Construction**

#### Refuse and Cycle Storage

- 3 Notwithstanding the submitted plans, prior to first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted, further details of the proposed refuse and cycle storage areas shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include: the final location of the storage area, details of the external appearance and scale of the storage areas, and a scheme for the protection of the retained trees.

Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development would not result in any unacceptable adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the area and the significance of the Conservation Area, as required by Policy DE1 and EN6 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

#### Crime Prevention

- 4 Before the development hereby permitted is occupied, a scheme of crime prevention measures shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter, the approved measures shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation, and shall be retained and maintained throughout the operation of the use, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of minimising crime and disorder, and the fear of crime and disorder.

#### **Management Plan**

5 Before the development hereby permitted is occupied, a Site Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Site Management Plan shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following details:

- Noise Management;
- Waste Management; and
- Amenity area management (including internal and external shared areas and hours of use)

Thereafter, the approved Site Management Plan shall be implemented prior to first use and shall be strictly adhered to throughout the operation of the use, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity of existing and future residents of the area.

#### **Ongoing Conditions**

8 The HMO use (Sui Generis) hereby permitted shall be limited to 2(no) individual houses of multiple occupation, each with 12 no. bedrooms and no more than 12.no occupants, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

This page is intentionally left blank