



**SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL**



Planning Committee

25 September 2025

Additional Information Report

This report sets out additional information in relation to planning applications for consideration at the Planning Committee on 25th September 2025 that was received after the Agenda was published.

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)

Site Address: Land At Wilsford Lane, Ancaster

Information Received: Updated Site access Plan
Amendment to the wording of Condition 16
Additional foul drainage implementation condition

Summary:

An updated site access plan has been provided which the highway authority considers acceptable. This replaces the access shown on the illustrative masterplan. Accordingly, the approved plan, Condition 3 is recommended to be updated.

Additionally, the applicant has requested that Condition 16 be varied to allow the occupation of 18 dwellings ahead of the off-site highway improvement works being undertaken.

An additional condition is required in relation to foul drainage to ensure that prior to the occupation of any dwellings the approved foul drainage works are undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Officer Evaluation

The proposed amendments have been assessed by the highway authority who have confirmed that they raise no objection and are content with the proposed changes.

The amendment to condition 3 would result in the formation of a vehicular access off Wilsford Lane with the required specification and visibility.

The highway authority has confirmed that the occupation of 18 dwellings ahead of the off-site highway improvements would not be detrimental to highway safety.

In light of the above, it is recommended to amend Condition 3 and Condition 16 of the schedule of conditions to read the following:

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans:
- i) Site Location Plan Drawing No. WL-001 Rev B
 - ii) Proposed Site Access P24058-001C

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.

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

- 16 No more than 18 dwellings (25% of the scheme), hereby permitted shall be occupied before the works to improve the public highway as shown in drawing 'NEW GIVEWAY' under Sheet Number '35171-SUT-ZZ-XX-DR-C-6400 P02' or an alternative scheme to be funded by the developer and delivered by the Highway Authority, as stipulated in the accompanying S106 Agreement, have been certified complete by the Local Planning Authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision of safe and adequate means of access to the permitted development for pedestrians of all abilities.

An additional condition 27 is required to ensure that the approved foul drainage details are implemented.

- 27 Before any dwelling(s) hereby permitted is/are occupied/brought into use, the works to provide the foul water drainage shall have been completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory surface and foul water drainage is provided in accordance with Policy EN5 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

Recommendation

Recommendation – Part 1

To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to GRANT planning permission, subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement securing the necessary financial contribution towards healthcare provision, education, highway works, open space and affordable housing and subject to the proposed conditions detailed within the main report, and subject to the revised conditions set out above.

.

Recommendation – Part 2

Where the Section 106 Agreement has not been concluded prior to the Committee, a period not exceeding 12 weeks after the date of the Committee shall be set for the completion of the obligation.

In the event that the agreement has not been concluded within the 12-week period and where, in the opinion of the Assistant Director – Planning, there are no extenuating circumstances which would justify a further extension of time, the related planning application shall be refused for the following reason(s): The applicant has failed to enter into a planning obligation to secure the necessary financial contribution towards provision of local surgery(s), secondary education and affordable housing. As such the necessary criteria essential to make what would otherwise be unacceptable development acceptable have not been forthcoming.

Agenda Item 6

S24/0568

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

Site Address: Development East of Sewstern Industrial Estate, South of Sewstern Road, Gunby

Summary of Information Received:

- Legal Advice from Counsel (**Appendix 1**) to be published separately.
- Representation from Block Action Group (**Appendix 2**)
- Representation from CPRE (**Appendix 3**)

Officer Advice to Members

Appendix 1 contains a copy of the formal written advice received from Counsel in relation to the appeal. As previously identified in the Committee Report, the Counsel advice is exempt from publication due to it containing details which are subject to legal privilege, and therefore, publication of this information could prejudice the Council's position in relation to the forthcoming appeal. Relevant information regarding this matter will be put in the public domain at the appropriate time.

Following publication of the Agenda, a further written representation has been received on behalf of the Block Action Group and CPRE; copies of these representations are appended to this report at Appendix 2 and 3 respectively and have been published in full on the Council's application portal. The matters raised can be summarised as follows:

- **Timescales for public participation in the Council's appeal review process.**

As set out within the Committee Report, the timetable for the forthcoming Inquiry is determined by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS), who are responsible for administering the appeal. The published timetable requires the Council to submit their full Statement of Case by 7th October, which has resulted in a very short timeframe in which to seek the Committee's view on the updated evidence.

Interested parties, including statutory consultees and members of the public, have been formally notified and are invited to submit any comments directly to PINS. This is separate from the Council's position on the appeal, which must deal solely with the reason for refusal and the evidence to support it.

- **Formal consultation with all statutory consultees**

As stated above, Officers' have consulted with the relevant technical consultees in relation to the updated evidence submitted as part of the appeal, this has included engagement with Leicestershire County Council as the Highways Authority for Buckminster village.

Leicester County Council (as the Highways Authority) have now formally responded as follows:

The LHA previously responded to this application on 17th May 2024 and 5th July 2024, advising that there would appear to be no material impact on the Leicestershire County Council (LCC) maintained public highway, therefore the LHA has no comments to make.

Given that the accesses join the highway within Lincolnshire LHA jurisdiction, LCC LHA will not provide comments on the access arrangement.

The LHA also note from the information there are no proposed alterations to the use or size of the facility and therefore the LHA comments from the 17th May 2024 relating to trip generation remain unchanged. For avoidance of doubt the LHA trip generation comments from the 17th May 2024 have been repeated below:

“The trip generation concludes that during the harvest period the Leicestershire highway network could expect to see a total of 50 two way trips from HGVs during the harvest period travelling to the Buckminster Estate fields.”

However during the non-harvest period the LHA could expect to see a total of 21 two way HGV movements per day to the Buckminster Estate fields.

The LHA note that not all the HGV movements will be carried out during the AM and PM peak periods and the HGV will utilise the B676. The number of HGVs associated with this development are negligible when compared against the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT). Therefore it is not considered that the proposed will have a severe impact on the local highway network, in accordance with Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)”

To conclude, there would appear to be no material impact on LCC public highway, therefore LCC LHA, have no further comments to make.

- **Compliance with Environmental Impact Assessment regulations.**

In respect of the requirements for additional consultation under the Environmental Impact Assessment regime, Officer's have engaged with the instructed Counsel on this procedural matter and have also raised the matter to the Appeal Case Officer. As referenced above, PINS are the responsible body for administering the appeal and therefore, they are responsible for any decisions about the requirement for further formal consultation on the updated evidence. Counsel's advice in relation to compliance with the EIA Regulations is set out within Appendix 1.

- **Weight to be given to the updated evidence**

As set out within the main report, the Council has a responsibility to review their position on the appeal in light of the updated evidence submitted by the Appellant. The Appellant has indicated that the updated evidence supersedes their previous assessments, and therefore, the Council is required to review their position on the appeal on the basis of the new evidence base. Failure to review the updated evidence could result in costs being awarded against the Council.

- **Adequacy of the updated assessments and comments on their conclusions**

The Block Action Group representations have raised a number of concerns about the accuracy and robustness of the updated evidence. Officers have engaged with the relevant technical consultees, and specifically asked for their assessment on the robustness of the assessments and their methodology, the comments received from these consultees are reported within the main report.