

Meeting of the Planning Committee

Thursday, 14 May 2026, 10.00 am



**SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL**

Committee Members present

Councillor Penny Milnes (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing
Councillor Pam Byrd
Councillor Helen Crawford
Councillor Paul Fellows
Councillor Gloria Johnson
Councillor Sarah Trotter
Councillor Mark Whittington
Councillor Paul Wood
Councillor Max Sawyer

Other Members present

Councillor Gareth Knight
Councillor Tim Harrison
Councillor Paul Martin
Councillor Murray Turner

Officers

Emma Whittaker, Assistant Director (Planning & Growth)
Adam Murray, Principal Planning Officer
Debbie Wetherill, Development Management Planner
Joshua Mann, Democratic Services Officer
Martha Rees, Senior Lawyer - Planning, Legal Services Lincolnshire

128. Election of Vice-Chairman

It was proposed, seconded and AGREED for Councillor Sarah Trotter to be elected as Vice-Chairman of the meeting.

129. Register of attendance and apologies for absence

Apologies for absence was received from Councillors Patsy Ellis and Vanessa Smith.

Councillor Max Sawyer substituted for Councillor Vanessa Smith.

130. Disclosure of interests

It was noted that residents' communications regarding application S25/0024 had been sent to all Members of the committee prior to the meeting. The

committee confirmed that they were approaching the application with an open mind.

Councillor Penny Milnes disclosed an interest in application S25/1860 as she had called-in the item and registered to speak on the application. Councillor Milnes noted that she would withdraw from the committee and the chamber for the duration of the item after speaking.

131. Minutes of the meeting held on 16 April 2026

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 April 2026 were agreed as an accurate record.

132. Application S25/2394

Proposal: Section 73 application to vary condition 1 (Approved Plans) of planning permission reference S24/1453 (Application for reserved matters relating to layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and access following outline planning permission S22/106).

Location: The Gables, Honington Road, Barkston, Lincolnshire, NG32 2NG

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

There were no public speakers.

Together with:

- Provisions within the South Kesteven District Council Local Plan 2011-2036.
- The National Planning Policy Framework
- No objections were received from Lincolnshire County Council Highways.
- Comments received from the Parish Council.
- No comments received from Environmental Protection.

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

- It was confirmed that the building regulations would ensure that the driveway would be suitable for waste collection vehicles.
- Members acknowledged that the design of the driveway would maximise the garden size of the properties, promoting private maintenance of most of the site. Members praised the practical nature of this.
- Responding to a Member's concerns about noise pollution, the Planning Officer noted that the proposed treeline would provide acoustic mitigation and the surface material of the driveway had been conditioned within the previous application approval. The type of trees was regulated within the soft landscaping condition.

- It was noted a previous full application had been refused, primarily due to the relationship of the plot. However, this application had to be assessed on its own merit.

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

133. Application S25/1860

Councillor Penny Milnes stepped down from chairing the meeting, and Vice-Chairman Councillor Sarah Trotter assumed the role for the remainder of the item.

Councillor Mark Whittington disclosed that he knew the applicant's agent personally and withdrew from the Chamber for the duration of the item.

Proposal: Outline application for residential development. All matters reserved except access.

Location: Claypole Road, Newark, Stubton, NG23 5BU

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

Noting comments in the public speaking session from:

District Ward Councillor	- Cllr Penny Milnes
Parish Council	- Jackie Britten-Crooks
Applicant	- Ben Wills [Agent]

Together with:

- The SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036, Stubton Neighbourhood Plan, and Supplementary Planning Document
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Representations received from the Parish Council.
- Comments received from Highways and SUDS.
- Comments received from the Environmental Agency.
- Comments received from Anglian Water.
- Comments received from Heritage Lincolnshire.
- Comments received from the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.

The following comments were made by public speakers:

- The position of SKDC was noted in respect of the tilted balance.
- It was noted that there was no bus, shop, school, or pub within the immediate vicinity.
- Concern was noted about the indicative plan.

- The road was linear and the site position was slightly elevated compared to nearby properties and this raised concerns about drainage. The applicant's agent assured that a suitable solution would be accommodated for any drainage concerns.
- The properties proposed in the rear of the site was not in keeping with the area and caused the most concern.
- There were other large properties on the road, including a large holiday home whose countryside appeal would be detrimentally affected by the exposed properties proposed at the rear of the site.
- The Parish Council did not oppose the principle of development but reserved concerns about the proposed layout.
- Stubton had already facilitated a significant proportion of the new dwellings across South Kesteven in 2026.
- This exceeded the usual infill categorised development size of no more than three dwellings.
- The land had been owned by the applicant's agent's father for 30 years, so the developer was local to the village.
- The biodiversity net gain would be offsite.
- The Applicant noted that similar developments had been approved by SKDC, such as on Doddington Road.

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

- A Member commented his assumption that the local villagers seemed relaxed about the prospect of the development since only five letters of representation had been received.
- The applicant's agent was urged by a Member to account for the concerns of locals about drainage and flooding. The agent noted that he had already been undertaking flooding prevention measures personally.

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

- Concern was noted that the application was contrary to SP2 and SP4 of the Local Plan.
- A Member stated that they did not oppose the principle of the development but felt the indicative layout of the site was too dense. The Planning Officer confirmed that the application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved. Therefore, details relating to the layout would be subject to consideration as part of the reserved matters application.
- It was confirmed that the height of the buildings would also be determined at the reserve matters stage.
- The indicative plan contained five properties as this was the application received from the developer.
- Members noted SKDC's position with the tilted balance.

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

subject to conditions, and incorporating the amendment suggested to condition eight within the officer's presentation. Namely, to amend condition eight to the following:

- The development hereby permitted shall comprise no more than five dwellings in total.
- Reason: To define the scope of the permission and to ensure that the scale of the development is appropriate to the site and its surroundings, in accordance with DE1 and EN1 of the SK Local Plan.

The meeting adjourned at 11.22.

134. Application S24/2218

The meeting resumed at 13.00.

Application: 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 & Growth to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement.

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

District Ward Councillors:

- Cllr Tim Harrison
- Cllr Gareth Knight
- Cllr Paul Martin
- Cllr Matt Bailey (written statement)
- Cllr Ben Green (written statement)
- Cllr Charmaine Morgan (written statement)

Against:

- County Cllr Richard Davies
- Roger Graves

Applicant:

- Stuart Bizley [Agent]

Together with:

- Negotiations with Network Rail

The following comments were made by the public speakers:

- The bridge was the justification for the initial development, and this should be prioritised over further affordable housing.
- Two statutory transport consultees opposed the application.

- The removal of the condition to build the bridge would undermine public trust in the planning system.
- Removing the obligation for the developer to build the bridge would remove all chance of the bridge being built at the detriment of local infrastructure.
- The issues with the land negotiations should have been identified and raised sooner.
- Attention was drawn to the objections raised by Lincolnshire County Council.
- The connectivity factor for the development was below average which was insufficient given that 1000 children would live within the development.
- The viability study was inaccurate and misleading.
- Given that the planning permission was soon set to expire, this would provide an opportunity for fresh studies to be completed under a new application.
- Network Rail had never quoted a price for the ransom strip.
- The application exceeded a technical change.
- Approving the application would have set a precedent that developers could remove conditions after planning permission was agreed.
- There was demand for the bridge within the local community.
- The developer was not in financial distress and had failed to provide the written updates required under the Section 106 agreement.
- The application conflicted SKDC's Local Plan.
- There would only be one main access route to the development without the bridge.
- The applicant's agent noted that negotiations had been ongoing with Network Rail until 2013 and a solution to the site's insufficient electricity provisions was not found until May 2020. Were the bridge condition to remain then viability studies show there would be a reduction in Section 106 agreement funding and affordable housing.
- Negotiations with Network Rail broke down as they demanded 50% plus £500,000 to sign the paperwork. The developer's position was 33%.

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

- When the A1 is frequently closed due to accidents, Grantham becomes gridlocked by diverted traffic. The bridge would help alleviate this.
- Some Members and public speakers suggested the need for an updated transport assessment.
- A speaker stated that they had not seen evidence that negotiations had ever taken place with Network Rail and suggested that a proportion of the funds raised from the properties sold so far had been reserved to fund the bridge.
- There was no defined cycle path from the development to the town centre. Using the footpath under the rail bridge was unsafe, particularly at rush hour.

- A speaker stated that they had contacted Network Rail via a freedom of information request, which had confirmed that Network Rail had no position on the ransom strip and no cost for its purchase had ever been agreed.
- The bridge was in the original masterplan for the development.
- The applicant's agent noted that the landowner would only make money from the sale of the land, not the profit from the development.

It was proposed, seconded, and AGREED to extend the meeting until 17.00.

- The applicant's agent was asked if they had overestimated the ransom cost. He rebuked this stating that Network Rail had a statutory duty to maximise their profit as a public body.
- The agent believed that the timeframe was too short to consider other viability options as the planning consent expired in June 2026.
- The agent stated that the applicant first raised red flags in 2020 when a feasibility study confirmed that the bridge was not necessary.

The meeting adjourned at 14.52 and resumed at 15.09.

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

- A Member suggested a level crossing would be a suitable compromise.
- It was confirmed that the viability reports had been independently created.
- The Planning Officer noted that, given the restrictive nature of the planning condition, Network Rail were entitled to 33% value of each house built over 750 houses.
- In response to a query about the accuracy of the price estimate to build the bridge, the Planning Officer noted that and changes to the costs would impact the viability assessment. However, the Officer noted that the assessments had been undertaken by professionals.
- For consideration between the different viability options, a Member noted that the Section 106 contributions fund bus links within the development.
- It was confirmed that 124 affordable homes had been built to date.
- A Member believed that the viability study was fundamentally flawed as it did not account for the profit from the properties already built. The Planning Officer responded that the developer was entitled to make a profit and the benchmark land value had been factored into the viability study. Furthermore, it was not possible to determine excess profit.
- It was queried whether the predicted vehicle impact in future years had been analysed. The Planning Officer noted that transport modelling had been undertaken and factored in the impact of the Grantham Relief Road.
- It was acknowledged that the developer may refuse to surpass completing 750 properties to avoid triggering the condition to build the bridge.

- It was noted that LCC Highways had stated that a footbridge would be more suitable, but the application was for a vehicular bridge.
- A Member believed their own calculations demonstrated a £45-60 Million profit for the developer and therefore they could afford to build the bridge. The Planning Officer noted there were other financial factors that needed to be accounted for and reiterated that the viability studies had been completed by professionals.
- A Member suggested that BCIS index should have been used for cost estimates rather than Spons index. The Planning Officer confirmed that Spons had been used during the process and the estimated cost to build the bridge was in line with a similar project undertaken by LCC.
- The Section 106 agreement was index linked.
- A Member suggested adding the sports fields to viability option three. However, the Planning Officer noted that the sports pitches cost £1.2 Million whilst there was only a remaining surplus of £105,194.
- Many Members agreed that the bridge was a necessary feature of the development as the connectivity without it was insufficient. However, the Planning Officer reiterated to Members that they needed to consider the impact of the new relief road in their weighting.
- It was suggested by a Member that the developer had deliberately ran the clock down to apply pressure for the removal of the condition to build the bridge.
- Members expressed frustration that the applicant did not approach sooner to take advise about securing alternative funding.
- It was proposed that the recommendation was accepted, however this was not seconded by the committee, so the proposal fell.

It was proposed, seconded, and AGREED to extend the meeting until 17.15.

The meeting was adjourned at 16.50 and resumed at 16.59.

It was proposed, seconded, and AGREED to extend the meeting until 17.30.

It was proposed, seconded and AGREED to resolve to approve the application that removed the condition, subject to a Section 106 agreement which secured scenario four, retaining the bridge obligation at 750 dwellings with a Section 106 package of a total of £4 Million, retaining the sports pitches and with an overall affordable housing requirement of 8% across the remainder of the site.

It was noted that Councillors Harrish Bisnauthsing, Sarah Trotter, and Mark Whittington were unable to vote as they were not present for the entirety of the item at the previous meeting before it was deferred.

135. Application S25/0024

It was proposed, seconded, and AGREED to defer application S25/0024.

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

There was none.

The meeting concluded at 17.30.