

# Minutes

## Planning Committee

Thursday, 19 February 2026, 10.00 am

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 Harrish Bisnauthsing  
Councillor Pam Byrd  
Councillor Helen Crawford  
Councillor Paul Fellows  
Councillor Tim Harrison  
Councillor Sarah Trotter  
Councillor Mark Whittington

### Cabinet Members present

Councillor Phil Dilks (Cabinet Member for Planning)

### Other Members present

Councillor Paul Martin  
Councillor Max Sawyer  
Councillor Zoe Lane

### Officers

Adam Murray (Principal Development Management Planner)  
Venezia Ross-Gilmore (Senior Planning Officer)  
Kevin Cartwright (Senior Planning Officer)  
Letitia Barrowcliff (Assistant Planning Officer)  
Hannah Noutch (Development Management Planner)  
Amy Pryde (Democratic Services Officer)  
Martha Rees (Legal Advisor)

---

### 89. Register of attendance and apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Vanessa Smith, Paul Wood, Gloria Johnson and Patsy Ellis.

Councillor Max Sawyer substituted for Councillor Vanessa Smith.

## 90. Disclosure of interests

Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing declared he was the Ward Councillor for S25/2401, however, he came to the Committee with an open mind.

Councillor Pam Byrd declared a personal interest for S25/0250. She would not participate in the meeting and would leave the Chamber.

Councillor Paul Fellows declared he was a Bourne Town Councillor and Ward Member for S25/0514. He came to the Committee with an open mind.

Councillor Tim Harrison was Ward Councillor for 3 applications on the agenda, however, he came to the Committee with an open mind.

Councillor Helen Crawford declared she was a Bourne Town Councillor for S25/0514, however, she came to the Committee with an open mind.

Councillor Charmaine Morgan declared an interest on S25/2345 and S25/1653, S25/1526 as a member of Grantham Town Council. She came to the Committee with an open mind.

The Chairman made the following statement:

‘With regards to application S25/2401 on the agenda, I make a declaration on behalf of all members that whilst it is acknowledged that the Council are the Applicant, this will not affect how members of the planning committee determine the application. All members have been trained and will determine the applications in accordance with their planning training and with an open mind. Any member who does not feel they are open minded to determine the applications should make a declaration to that effect and not vote on the application.’

## 91. Minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2025 were proposed, seconded and **AGREED** as a correct record.

## 92. Minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2026

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2026 were proposed, seconded and **AGREED** as a correct record.

## 93. Application S25/2345

### Proposal:

Planning application for a proposed change of use of Offices (Use Class E) to a 13-bedroom House in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) (Use Class Sui

Generis) at rear ground floor and upper floors.  
Replacement windows  
**Location:** 24 St Peter's Hill, Grantham, Lincolnshire NG31  
6QF  
**Recommendation:** To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to  
GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

District Ward Councillors	Cllr Ben Green (Statement) Cllr Matt Bailey (Statement)
Applicant	Rahul Patel - Eldom Properties Ltd

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036 and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- Comments received from Lincolnshire County Council (Highways).
- Comments received from Grantham Town Council.
- No comments received from SKDC Environmental Protection.
- No comments received from Lincolnshire Police Designing Out Crime Officer.
- Comments received from NHS Lincolnshire Integrated Care Board.

The following comments were made by the public speakers:

- The over intensifications of HMOs in Grantham affecting the neighbourhood character, residential amenity, and community cohesion.
- That the application did not comply with DE1 and EN4 due to respecting local character and avoiding unacceptable impacts alongside environmental effects in terms of noise, waste storage, servicing, disturbance, and over-concentration.
- A failure to satisfy policy E6 due to loss of employment space. It was felt the supported housing benefit was not secured.
- Concern was raised on the consistency with a previously refused application of an HMO.
- The Applicant confirmed the building would be used as a therapy centre. The ground floor frontage would remain as commercial use.
- It was noted that no objections had been received from consultees or neighbours.
- That Policy GR4 supported the reuse of an existing building for a range of purposes, including residential.

- Officers had concluded the scheme would not provide harmful over concentration.
- The property would be leased to a registered social housing provider, working with the Council to ensure the scheme provides benefits for the community.
- In terms of amenity standards, all bedrooms exceed the HMO licensing standards.
- Dedicated bin storage, a secure cycle shelter and on-site parking would be provided with no objections from Environmental Health.

During questions to the Applicant, Members commented on the following:

- Clarification was sought around the term 'supported housing' and who would be providing the support at what times.

The Applicant confirmed the property would work in conjunction with the Council, Chapta and 3C Housing Association to deliver support housing. There would be a counselling room on site and would cater for residents with mental health, recovery from drug abuse or people released from prison.

- Concern was raised on the size of the rooms and outdoor space, especially if people with mental health struggles would reside there.

Clarification was provided around the size of the rooms, off-suites and dressing rooms and they met HMO standards for licensing.

- A query was raised on whether the Applicant had undertaken a broader search on other businesses on what could be commercially available.
- Clarification was sought on why the Applicant felt this location was appropriate, given the small outdoor amenity space for potential residents.

It was highlighted that the proposed therapy centre seemed like the ideal location due to its proximity to the centre of the town.

The Applicant had allocated 14 cycle sheds to the rear of the building, which would provide each occupant with a space to park their cycle, alongside a space for the counselling team. It was felt the location had adequate train and bus services nearby. The property would also have commercial bins available.

- Whether staff would be present on site 24 hours a day.

It was confirmed that a counsellor would visit the counselling room for 2-3 hours per day.

- A query was raised on who would maintain the 2 communal kitchens.

The Applicant stated that a lease would be signed with Chapta who would maintain and clean all communal areas. The property would have regular inspections take place.

- Whether the Applicant had considered using the counselling room as dual purpose.

The Applicant confirmed they were open for suggestions on use of the counselling room.

- One Member queried how the application complied with SKDC Local Plan Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Applicant highlighted the application complied with all minimum standards by 20% and they would work in close conjunction with Chapter.

- Concern was raised that no contract had yet been signed by Chapta and that another HMO provider may come in and negotiate for the site.

The Applicant confirmed Chapta were awaiting approval of the planning permission prior to signing the agreement.

- One Member requested whether surveys and evidence had been produced on parking. Concern was raised that majority of people may have a vehicle.

It was clarified that information had been provided from Chapta and the Council on the targeted residents and tenants for the property. The feedback received showed a very high chance of the residents Not owning their own vehicle.

- Further clarification was sought around waste provision.

It was confirmed 2 commercial bins would be provided for mixed waste and recycling. It was assumed the collections would be weekly, however, this would be dealt with Chapta and the Housing Association.

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

- That bedroom 10 did not have any wash facilities or cooking facilities.

It was confirmed bedroom 10 had an off-suite bathroom and dressing room across the hallway to access. They could access a kitchen on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the property.

- That paragraph 7.4.1 outlined proposed that the HMO be used for supported housing for vulnerable individuals. It was queried whether the property would be entirely supported housing.

It was proposed for the entirety of the building to be supported living and individuals would be assessed through Chaptal in line with a contract.

Members were reminded that there should be no consideration for the people who may reside the property. The Planning Committee needed to consider the land use only.

For transparency, the Chairman highlighted that the Council were in conversations with the Applicant in terms of housing certain people in the property but this should not prejudice any decision.

- One Member felt the application conflicted against policies DE1, E6, H4, SP3, GR4 and the NPPF.

The Principal Development Management Planner clarified policy E6 related to the loss of employment land and would need to meet the criteria, however, the policy allowed loss of employment land to non-employment uses where it demonstrates compliance with any one of the criteria.

The policy itself protected primary shopping frontages; however, the proposed property was not within the primary shopping frontage. The ground floor frontage use would be retained for commercial purposes.

The site was considered a town centre location with local transport available nearby. The site was within close distance to public car parks.

- One Member queried whether the parking provision had been 'stress-tested' locally.

It was confirmed that no parking assessment had taken place, however, Lincolnshire County Council (Highways) were satisfied with the parking provision.

- Concern was raised around the external amenity space being too small for 13 people.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed the space was a suitable quality of amenity space internally and externally for possible tenants.

- Clarification was sought on whether a measurement had been completed on the external space of the building for bins.

It was clarified there was not a minimum requirement for outside amenity space for an HMO. The drawings illustrated there would be sufficient space for two large bin containers.

- Concern was raised on mass congregation outside the front of the HMO.
- A query was raised on whether any weight could be given to the shop frontage being sold below the property.

The Principal Development Management Planner highlighted policy GR4 and primary shopping frontages. The policy recognised that the ground floor commercial use wanted to be retained but did allow for other uses.

- Concern was raised on a fire evacuation risk of 13 people evacuating from the back door only, amongst bins and bicycles.

Licensing regimes would deal with minimum space standards for the internal area. There was no standard for external amenity space.

- One Member proposed refusal of the application based on the cumulative impact of HMOs in Grantham in terms of character of the area and parking provision meaning it was contrary to policy DE1 and the aims of the NPPF.
- Further concern was raised on health, safety and wellbeing of the occupants of the HMO.

The proposal to refuse the application was not considered due to an original proposal to approve the application being debated. Under the Constitution it would require the proposal to approve the application to fall before the refusal could be debated.

- A query was raised on whether licensing regimes were a material planning consideration.

The Legal Advisor noted that matters covered by licensing regimes were not a material planning consideration. The NPPF dictates that Members should assume that other regulations and regulatory functions would operate appropriately and successfully.

The Chairman noted it was SKDC policy to encourage landlords to open up accommodation above shops and that at least 60 flats were available in Grantham Town Centre.

### **Final decision**

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to 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 and Existing Block Plan, drawing ref. FB25-0802 EX01A (received 03/12/25)
  - ii) Proposed Floor Plans, drawing ref. FB25-0802 PL02 (received 03/12/25)
  - iii) Proposed Elevations, drawing ref. FB25-0802 PL03A (received 04/02/26)
  - iv) Proposed Window Details, drawing ref. FB25-0802 W01 (received 17/12/25)

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.

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

## **During Construction**

### Crime Prevention

- 3 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

- 3 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

- 4 The HMO use (Sui Generis) hereby permitted shall be limited to 1(no) individual house of multiple occupation with 13 no. bedrooms and no more than 13.no occupants, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

*(Councillors Tim Harrison, Mark Whittington, Sarah Trotter and Harrish Bisnauthsing voted AGAINST the proposal to approve the application).*

### 94. Application S25/1653

<b>Proposal:</b>	Planning application for a proposed change of use of Offices (Use Class E) to 3no. houses in multiple occupation (HMO) (Use Class Sui Generis)
<b>Location:</b>	29-31 Avenue Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire NG31 6TH
<b>Recommendation:</b>	To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

District Ward Councillors	Cllr Ben Green (Statement) Cllr Matt Bailey (Statement) Cllr Paul Martin
On behalf of the Applicant	Jon Cook

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036 and National Planning Policy Framework.
- Comments received from Lincolnshire County Council (Highways)
- Comments received from Grantham Town Council
- Comments received from SKDC Environmental Protection
- Comments received from County Councillor Paul Martin

The following comments were made by the public speakers:

- That due to other HMOs on Avenue Road, this could mean up to 100 HMO residents within an area in the centre of Grantham.
- Concern around parking, traffic and road congestion on the road.
- Noise disturbance and anti-social behaviour concerns.
- Loss of family housing.
- Intensification of HMOs within Grantham.

- That the application differs materially from both the previous use and the surrounding residential context.
- Concern was raised around activity levels, waste management, parking pressures, and the wider cumulative effects of HMO concentration.
- Over-Concentration of HMOs with no demonstrated local demand.
- Highway safety in terms of schoolchildren.
- Total loss of employment with no marketing evidence provided.
- Insufficient information and amenity in terms of refuse storage details, and boundary treatments.

On behalf of the Applicant:

- The Agent confirmed 14 off-road parking spaces and bicycle storage would be provided.
- HMOs and shared living accommodation were overlooked solutions to the country's housing crisis. It would help to meet the demand through reuse and conversion of existing properties and house multiple people at lower cost.
- The Agent noted the Applicant was a local and reputable award-winning landlord with a collective experience of more than 40 years owning and managing properties of this nature.
- It was noted the proposal would not bring any harm to the character of the area as the only alterations would be boundary treatments and the installation of the bike storage.
- There had been no objections from statutory consultees.
- The proposal was a central location with good access to local facilities and amenities.

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

- A query was raised on how Lincolnshire County Council (Highways) justify that residents of the property would not own a car.

The District Ward Councillor clarified the authority follow a sustainable transport initiative whereby public transport can be used instead of a car.

- One Member requested clarification around the concern on emergency vehicles accessing the property due to parking issues.

It was confirmed that Highways had stated 2 cars could pass parallel on Avenue Road alongside parked cars. The District Ward Councillor felt this was incorrect. If an emergency service vehicle needed to park/access the road, it would most likely block the road.

- Clarification was sought around the main concern of 3 buildings becoming in terms of over intensification.
- Comments received from local residents on parking were requested.

The District Ward Councillor noted that surrounding streets to the area were overcrowded at present. It was felt the area was over saturated with issues around parking and traffic and this application would make it worse.

- Whether there was enough space available to the rear of the properties for cars to manoeuvre and utilise the spaces.

The District Ward Councillor stated the rear of a property was a small lane and was quite small and restrictive.

- One Member queried why the Agent had not considered turning the properties into dual use to cater for a wider range of communities.

The Agent clarified that more than 1 person per room may potentially exacerbate the parking issues. The business model from the Applicant was to cater for young, single professionals.

- Whether there would be any space lost for waste bins.

The Agent confirmed there was plenty of space at the back of the properties and down the side of the building to accommodate waste.

- Clarification sought that out of 34 people possibly residing the property, that only 14 would own a vehicle.

The Agent outlined that not everyone was likely to have a vehicle, and it was a sustainable location in the town centre. There were close car parks nearby and the Applicant would explore options for including free parking in their rent.

- One Member felt the application failed policy SP3 due to 34 people residing in the 3 houses. The Agent was asked to clarify how the application met policy SP3.

It was confirmed the building was previously used as a large legal practice. The properties would enable young professionals to work locally or use various modes of transport.

- Concern was raised on safety in the event of an emergency and evacuation procedure.
- A member queried if an agreement regarding parking could be reached with SKDC who own Welham Street Car Park nearby, however it was confirmed that any decision made could not be dependent upon a third party without their prior agreement.

The Applicant would require a HMO license and adhere to building regulations. This was a separate regime.

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

- Whether the property would be one person per bedroom or not.
- It was felt the application would impact the area. The buildings were previously used as an office between 9-5pm and the application would mean people living in the properties at all times.
- Members felt 14 car parking spaces was not sufficient for the application.

It was noted the quality of accommodation was superior to other HMO applications put before the committee with each room containing an ensuite and kitchen facilities. It was queried whether the term HMO was appropriate, or should the application be for flats.

Officers advised that were the application to be for flats that it would be permissible development.

Members recognised the quality of accommodation but remained concerned at the density of the application with in effect 3 sites being put forward together totalling 34 residents, instead of one totalling 11 which would have been more acceptable.

One Member proposed **REFUSAL** of the application for the following reasons:

- Loss of employment premises (Policy E6 and NPPF paragraphs 82 and 121).
  - Over intensification, poor standard of residential amenity (DE1, H4 and NPPF paragraph 130F).
  - Harm to neighbourhood amenity (Policies DE1, EN4 and NPPF paragraph 185).
  - Inadequate parking and highway safety concerns (Policy ID2 and NPPF paragraph 111).
  - Spatial strategy (Policies SP1, SP2, SP3).
  - Failure to demonstrate need or suitability for specialist accommodation (Policy H4 and NPPF paragraph 62).
  - Conflict with policy GR4 for Grantham Town Centre.
- Members raised concern on comments received from Highways and how they had come to their conclusion.

The Principal Development Management Planner highlighted that Officers were satisfied that policy E6 had been met and the loss of the use as an office at this time would not be detrimental to the overall supply.

Members would need to quantify and provide reasons as to why the proposal may be harmful, there were no external changes proposed.

In terms of crime and anti-social behaviour, the Committee were urged to assume other regulatory regimes would operate in an appropriate manner.

Advice had been provided by the Highways authority, the Committee were urged to follow the advice. If the Committee did not agree with the authority, they would need to demonstrate alternative evidence to support it.

The Committee were advised to be cautious on refusing on spatial strategy in terms of unsuitable scale of development. The principle of development in terms of location was the main concern.

- Members felt adding 34 people into properties in this area would not help in making a balanced community.
- Members discussed previous reasons for dismissed appeals for other applications that may be helpful in making a decision on this application.
- One Member queried whether lived experience of the road would be a material planning consideration.

It was clarified an Inspector would not accept lived or anecdotal experience, it would be quantitative data that would need to support a reason for refusal.

- One Member felt that 3 HMO's all next door to each other would be cramped and generate more traffic and issues with highways. The issue was with the cumulation on the amount of housing being put onto the one road.

The Principal Development Management Planner highlighted the same number of occupants and density of residential accommodation under permitted development rights if it was residential flats rather than a HMO. The only distinction was the HMO being shared accommodation with unrelated people as opposed to individual units with all facilities to operate independently.

- One Member sought clarification on how the application had evidence of local need in terms of policy H4.

Policy H4 was in line with major developments meaning 10 dwellings or more. This application was not a major development.

Members discussed the cumulative impact on whether they had sufficient information to be satisfied to determine whether the application would bring issues with parking and highway safety.

The Principal Development Management Planner reminded the Committee that an Inspector may deem the Council as 'unreasonable' for deferring the application on a single point and the point being rectified, for then the Council to refuse the application for other reasons.

- A query was made on whether permitted development fallback was realistic and demonstrably likely. It was further questioned whether the Committee were entitled to refuse a proposal that resulted in greater harm than the potential fallback position.



- The proposal secured an opportunity to secure and deliver measurably increased biodiversity within the District.
- It would create new woodlands, species-rich grasslands, a diverse traditionally managed orchard and over 400 metres of species-rich hedgerow. These would be secured legally via a S106 agreement for a minimum of 30 years.
- The proposal supported national policy and SKDC Local Plan policies.
- Strategic locations had been proposed from the Woodland Creation.
- Rare local species would be preserved.

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

- A query was raised on whether the proposal included any ponds to provide freshwater habitats.

The agent confirmed that during the first iterations of the proposals, ponds were included in the scheme. However, lower lying areas that most suited pond creation would also bring in water from the adjacent river, bringing in other fish and predatory species. It was felt this would be an overwhelming management burden to remove these species.

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

- One Member queried how the fertility of the land would be monitored.

It was confirmed that depending on the types of habitats being created, the type of land would be monitored on a low, medium or high distinctiveness. Visits to the site would take place periodically by a specialist ecologist appointed by the Council.

The habitat management plan and monitoring plan as part of the appendices included the baseline value with a biodiversity net gain metric. The management plan stated the biodiversity net-gain over the 30-year period and those monitoring visits were effectively checkpoints to ensure net gain is progressing as it should.

Members commended the hard work and detailed information provided by the Applicant.

- It was queried whether the biodiversity net-gain from the site could be prioritised to South Kesteven.

The biodiversity net-gain would be prioritised to South Kesteven.

### **Final decision**

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director of Planning & Growth to enter into a Section 106 Agreement with Enviroland to create, manage and maintain Biodiversity Net Gain Units for the purpose of satisfying Biodiversity Net Gain Obligations for developments for a period of 30 years.

## 96. Application S25/0514

<b>Proposal:</b>	Construction of 9no. dwellings, access, landscaping and parking
<b>Location:</b>	3, Drummond Road, Bourne
<b>Recommendation:</b>	To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions in the report

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

Against	Thomas Harvey Carl Harvey Diane Stabler and Samantha Carvath -(TIMESHARE)
Agent	Mark Collins

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036 and National Planning Policy Framework
- Comments received from Environmental Protection Services (SKDC)
- Comments received from LCC highways and SuDs
- Comments received from Anglian Water
- Comments received from Heritage Lincolnshire
- No comments received from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
- Comments received from Bourne Town Council
- Comments received from Black Sluice Drainage Board
- Comments received from National Grid
- Comments received from Bourne Civic Society

The following comments were made by the public speakers:

- A Public Speaker who resided next door to the site outlined the flooding directly out of the surface water drains.
- It was felt the developer was ignoring the water course despite the LLFA expressing strong concerns, specifically requesting a solution for the drain along the western boundary. There was no modelling for the watercourse at present.
- It was felt the application did not comply with Council policies or the NPPF.
- Concern was raised on access to the site, boundaries, noise levels and BNG baseline.
- That the water was coming from the Peak District via an aquifer and therefore the flooding was not linked to local weather conditions.
- There were 2 historical issues with the site relating to incoming water and the 220mm borehole feeding into the site. The water going out was in Anglian Water's drainage system through a 200mm pipe being fed from a 150mm pipe meaning the water level exceeded the level of the pipe.

- Concerns had been raised from the lead local flood authority and was being investigated by the internal drainage board ombudsman.
- 2 public speakers raised their concern on the boundary fence. They were advised this matter was a private boundary dispute and not something for the Planning Committee to consider.
- The agent had a background of working in drainage and would ensure there was no flooding to any proposed properties and to not increase flood risk to any nearby properties as a result of the development.
- It was proposed to adopt a sub-base system using a permeable road to provide sufficient storage to hold water, which would be released via a manhole at the bottom of the site restricted to a flow of two litres a second.
- A private management company would maintain the ditch in perpetuity.
- There was a proposal to lay an alleviation pipe between the drainage system and the ditch itself to capture any water that overflows from the ditch.

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

- Clarification was sought on a photograph provided and whether it was the result of direct running water from the Dyke not being contained or a blockage, or whether it was direct runoff water from the field behind the property.

The Public Speaker confirmed it was not solely run off rain water from the field. The water came from a borehole at the other side of the field which runs from a 220mm diameter pipe into the watercourse and then into a 150mm section. This section is not able to keep up with the flow of water. It was noted there were ongoing challenges with Anglian Water. It was highlighted that the property would flood with no rainfall.

- Clarification was sought around Anglian Water attending the property and the measures they had taken.

The Public Speaker had requested Anglian Water to attend and solve the situation numerous of times. He had also spoken to Highways drainage board, fire and police.

It was felt that Anglian Water surface water could not keep up with capacity and that resulted in the flooding.

- A query was raised on current use of the land of the proposal site.

It was confirmed the land was grassland and had no public access. The Public Speaker had no objection to dwellings being built on the land, the concern was around the flooding of his property.

- Whether the neighbour had any discussions or potential reassurance that the proposed application and measures proposed would alleviate the current flooding issues.

It was highlighted that when the watercourse had reached its banks it would then flow down the access road into attenuation storage, this could provide a brief respite to the flooding, until the attenuation storage became full.

- Clarification was sought on whether the proposal would make flooding matters worse.

The Public Speaker noted there was no information on how water would stop being held in the watercourse from going into the permeable pipe. This may alleviate issues short term, until the attenuation storage was at capacity.

- Whether an independent drainage strategy taking place would assist in the Public Speakers concern.

The Public Speaker confirmed a detailed drainage strategy would alleviate concerns, however, only if a firm solution was established.

- One Member sought further clarification on noise levels.

It was noted that the original noise assessment assessed tarmac rather than block paving and therefore, decibel levels were incorrect. The ground floor habitable room would have a seven-decibel reduction applied due to a timber fence proposed. The length of the fence would not reach the front of the property, and therefore the decibel reduction would not be met.

- Whether the developer could guarantee a solution to stop the following completely.

The Public Speaker felt an arrangement could be made to cap the borehole which would stop a significant amount of water coming onto the site. There could also be scope for the developers to adopt the maintenance of the pipe work to assist with water flow from it.

The Public Speaker could not see how the proposed development could be of any benefit in its current design to alleviate flooding.

- A query was raised on whether there was any pattern to times of the year the flooding occurred in terms of data.

The Public Speaker clarified the original assessments had not considered the aquifer or borehole. Flooding had occurred during peak summer where there had been no rainfall meaning there was no link to weather conditions.

- One Member asked the agent whether they should have considered a management company in place for the dyke prior to the planning process.

The agent clarified at the development stage, if any wild boreholes are found, they would be capped off. The developer would take responsibility for their half of the ditch.

- Whether there was a further update on a drainage strategy in relation to the dyke and the road.

An updated strategy drawing showed an intersection pipe sitting between the ditch and the road itself so any overflow would be caught.

- Further clarification was sought around the design approach from LCC SuDS approach outlined in the report.

It was clarified that LCC hadn't fully analysed the detailed design of the strategy. SuDS only provided water treatment and did not include the flow into the ground.

- A query was raised on the access road and whether the type of construction proposed was sufficiently strong for longevity for heavy vehicles.

The construction had been designed to allow heavy vehicles. A membrane would be installed at the bottom, followed by a sub-base which would provide a 30% void in the construction. A temporary tarmac running course would sit on top of the sub-base during construction phase. At the end of the development, granular sand would be laid down with sufficient voids and then a permeable block pave on top.

- Whether LCC were the landowners of the site.

The agent confirmed he was not aware of LCC being the owners of the site.

- A query was raised on why the land had not been developed before and whether this linked to the flooding.

The agent was unaware as to why the site had not previously been developed. It was noted the actual site itself did not suffer from any flooding.

The agent clarified the aquifer was a large void below ground soil that held water. Above the aquifer were clay soils which were stopping the water from coming up. The water was coming from artesian wells.

- Clarification was sought around the intersection pipe.

The intersection pipe would be a perforated pipe which would sit at the bottom of the ditch. This would catch any overflow water and would be directed to the carriageway of Drummond Road.

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

- That the local flood authority had very strong concerns on flood risk as a result of the development.
- Members had serious concerns around the flood issues and felt they should be addressed prior to any development being approved.

The Senior Planning Officer highlighted the previous refusal was primarily due to noise and disturbance and access safety. This access came from the north of the site, rather than the proposed access for this application.

- The Committee were concerned around all the conditions being met and fulfilled.
- Concern was raised around SuDS comments and the permeable road ownership.
- Further concern was raised on noise and vibrations.

A pre-commencement condition was proposed that would deal with surface water drainage and how that would be approved.

The Environmental Protection team, as a consultee had raised no objections to the application in terms of noise and vibrations.

It was confirmed a noise report had been submitted and was based on a smooth tarmac surface. An updated assessment was undertaken and clarified there would be an additional noise from a block paved surface.

A condition had been included in relation to boundary treatments making explicit reference to boundary treatments in attenuation fencing to reduce noise to the adjacent dwellings.

### **Final decision**

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to **REFUSE** planning permission, for the following reason:

*“The proposed development is at an unacceptable risk of increasing the risk of flooding for neighbouring land and properties, which cannot be satisfactorily addressed through imposition of planning conditions requiring the submission of a detailed drainage strategy, contrary to Policy EN5 of the adopted Local Plan and Section 14 of the Framework. The material considerations in this case, including the provision of housing which would be given limited weight due to the small quantum proposed, and the presence of the tilted balance, would not outweigh the identified harms and conflict with the Development Plan.”*

*(The Committee had a 5-minute break).*

## 97. Application S25/1916

<b>Proposal:</b>	Proposed demolition of existing barn and erection of a detached dwelling, hard and soft landscaping and formation of a re-wilding zone
<b>Location:</b>	Wildwood, Nightingale Lane, Aisby, NG32 3NE
<b>Recommendation:</b>	To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

District Ward Councillor  
Against

Cllr Sarah Trotter  
Simon Jones  
David Coleman  
John Dickie

On behalf of the Applicant

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Supplementary Planning Document
- Comments received from LCC Highways & SuDS
- Comments received from Heydour Parish Council
- Comments received from Environmental Protection
- No comments received from Historic England, The Gardens Trust

*(Councillor Sarah Trotter excluded herself from this application, due to speaking as Ward Councillor).*

The Development Management Planner clarified a note within the report stating the application state had an 'in progress' appeal. It was noted the appeal had been dismissed.

The following comments were made by the public speaker:

- The Ward Councillor highlighted there were five different applications on this site.
- The area was a small, rural village with distinct character, with limited infrastructure and a clear settlement pattern.
- Concern was raised on the cumulative and incremental impact of repeated applications on the site.
- The Ward Councillor's main concern related to whether the application overcame issues identified in previous refusals.
- That the application could push density beyond what was charismatic of the village.
- A neighbour to the property raised concern on continual 'creep' of the applications and requested refusal due to the scale and impact on privacy.

- It was felt the application did not meet certain policy requirements and provisions within the NPPF.
- That 11d of the NPPF did not comply with the proposal and that a dwelling was already consented under application S24/1822, therefore, did not increase housing delivery.
- It was felt the countryside designation had not changed and significant weight should be given to the recent appeal decision.
- It was also felt that Policy SP4 required local support, which the application did not have.
- The Parish Council had fully objected.
- The agent stated the proposed was a more improved plan to previous applications.
- The fallback position would enable a dwelling to be built on the site, however, the proposed was a better plan.
- The proposed ridge height was 6.4, an increase of only 10cm.
- The Officer had confirmed the site was discreetly located and not highly visible from within the village, with the nearest house being 110m away.
- Design and massing were a benefit to the scheme.
- The scheme would deliver an 104% net increase in biodiversity habitat units.

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

- A query was raised to the Ward Councillor on whether she felt visual harms could be conditioned in her opinion.

The District Ward Councillor had an overall concern of the 'creeping' next to the neighbour's boundary, which may cause disruption to them.

- Clarification was sought around the difference between this application, and the previously approved application. It was noted the application dismissed at appeal was significantly larger than the proposed.

The proposed application included a garage, which was not part of the originally approved application and the roof height had been increased on the plans, alongside more floor space.

- A query was raised to an objector on what mitigations would be satisfactory in order to protect privacy.

It was felt the fallback position would be preferred. It was felt that privacy screening would not block off any car noise or light.

The Principal Development Management Planner provided clarity around the boundary and dwellings via site plans. It was confirmed the proposed dwelling was around 110m away from the neighbour's property.

- How much closer the proposed development to the boundary was compared to the previous application.

The Public Speaker could not confirm how much closer the proposed development was, however, by using scaling it was clearly 1-2m closer to his boundary.

- One Member queried whether the proposed dwelling had windows overlooking into the neighbour's property.

It was clarified this proposal had less ground floor windows, which was a benefit.

- Clarification was sought around the barn building on the neighbours site which was closest to the proposed garage.

The barn building on the neighbours site was not used agriculturally and was used for storage.

A member asked if the new build would impact on the privacy of the neighbour and the speaker said it would not because the barn is in the way.

- A query was raised why another application had been submitted and how alterations differed from the original application.

The agent clarified there was some uncertainty following the appeal dismissed by the Inspector around what would be acceptable for a Class Q. This application secured the need for future proofing the applicant's accommodation requirements.

- Clarification was sought on whether the applicant had the intention to come back to the Committee with this application, following their previously approved application.

It was confirmed the intention was to come back to the Committee with this application, following the previously approved application.

- Members requested clarification over the square meterage of the originally application for the barn itself.

The Principal Development Management Planner highlighted the previous application had around 100sqm of floor space. This application was for a 260sqm floor space.

The original barn in terms of its footprint was approximately 100sqm. The extant fallback position in total floor space was 192sqm across two floors rather than a

single footprint. The proposed application was 260sqm floor space was over two floors. The garage was approximately 36sqm.

The height of the barn had increased by 10cm from the original planning application. There was a slight increase on the breadth of the barn to accommodate the additional floor space.

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

- That if the proposal is refused and the application returns to the extant application; a further application could come forward for an extension which would fall under permitted development rights.

It was proposed that enhanced landscaping could help mitigate against the concerns raised regarding light from vehicles and officers advised the conditions would include a comprehensive landscaping plan.

It was confirmed permitted development rights would be removed as part of the fallback position application. Therefore, any extension or alteration to the building would require a process through the authority.

Following a suggestion from a Member, it was clarified conditions had been recommended for landscaping details, which had been carried forward from the previous planning permission.

### **Final decision**

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to conditions:

#### **Time Limit for Commencement**

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**

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans:

- i. Drawing No.JDA 2025-0755-LOCATION.001 Location Plan
- ii. Drawing No.JDA 2025-0755-SITE.001 Proposed Site Plan
- iii. Drawing No.JDA 2025-0755-DETAILS.001 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations
- iv. Drawing No.JDA 2025-0755-LIGHTING.001 Proposed Lighting

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.

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

#### Before the Development is Commenced

Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, a scheme relating to the survey of the land for contamination shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

- i. A desk top study documenting all the previous and existing land uses of the site and adjacent land;
- ii. A site investigation report assessing the ground conditions of the site and incorporating chemical and gas analysis identified as appropriate by the desk top study; and
- iii. A detailed scheme for remedial works and measures to be undertaken to avoid risk from contaminants and/or gases when the site is developed and proposals for future maintenance and monitoring.
- iv. Shall include the nomination of a competent person to oversee the implementation of the works.

Reason: Previous activities associated with this site may have caused, or had the potential to cause, land contamination and to ensure that the proposed site investigations and remediation will not cause pollution in the interests of the amenities of the future residents and users of the development; and in accordance with Policies EN2 and EN4 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan and national guidance contained in the NPPF.

#### During Building Works

During construction of the development hereby permitted, the approved Construction Management Plan October 2025 (Drawing No.JDA/2025/755/CEMP/001) shall be adhered to in full unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Hard and soft landscaping and tree planting make an important contribution to the development and its assimilation with its surroundings and in accordance with Policies DE1, EN3 and OS1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

Before any of the works on the external elevations for the building(s) hereby permitted are begun, a detailed specification of the materials (including colour of any render, paintwork or colourwash) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development not cause pollution in the interests of the amenities of the future residents and users of the development; and in accordance with Local Plan Policy EN4.

Before any construction work above ground is commenced, details of any soft landscaping works shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include:

- i. planting plans;
- ii. written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment);
- iii. schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;

Reason: Soft landscaping and tree planting make an important contribution to the development and its assimilation with its surroundings and in accordance with Policies DE1, EN3 and OS1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

#### Before the Development is Occupied

Before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied/brought into use, the external surfaces shall have been completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

Before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied, a verification report confirming that remedial works have been completed shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority should any contaminated land be identified by the above condition. The report shall have been submitted by the nominated competent person approved, as required by condition above. The report shall include:

- i. A complete record of remediation activities, and data collected as identified in the remediation scheme, to support compliance with agreed remediation objectives;
- ii. As built drawings of the implemented scheme;

- iii. Photographs of the remediation works in progress; and
- iv. Certificates demonstrating that imported and/or material left in situ is free from contamination.

The scheme of remediation shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: Previous activities associated with this site may have caused, or had the potential to cause, land contamination and to ensure that the proposed site investigations and remediation will not cause pollution in the interests of the amenities of the future residents and users of the development; and in accordance with Policies EN2 and EN4 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan and national guidance contained in the NPPF.

Before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied/brought into use, all hard landscape and soft landscaping works shall have been carried out in accordance with the approved hard landscaping details.

Reason: Hard landscaping and tree planting make an important contribution to the development and its assimilation with its surroundings and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

### Ongoing

Within a period of five years from the first occupation of the final dwelling/unit of the development hereby permitted, any trees or plants provided as part of the approved soft landscaping scheme, that die or become, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced in the first planting season following any such loss with a specimen of the same size and species as was approved in condition above unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs and in accordance with Policies DE1, EN3 and OS1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, or re-enacting that Order, with or without modification), no enlargement, improvement or other alteration of the approved properties, shall be carried out without planning permission first having been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The Local Planning Authority considers that further development could cause harm to the character of the area, and for this reason would wish to control any future development and in accordance with Policy DE1 (Promoting Good Quality Design) of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, or re-enacting that Order, with or without modification), no buildings etc. incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, shall be constructed without planning permission first having been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The Local Planning Authority considers that further development could cause harm to the character of the area, and for this reason would wish to control any future development and in accordance with Policy DE1 (Promoting Good Quality Design) of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

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

#### **98. Application S25/0642**

**Proposal:** Change of use from existing agricultural field to create new leisure facility. Construction of golf driving range with associated clubhouse, parking, and amenities

**Location:** Existing Agricultural Field off Meadow Drove, Bourne

**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  
Applicant

Cllr Zoe Lane  
Mr Daniel Cundy

Together with:

- Provision within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036 and National Planning Policy Framework.
- Comments received from LCC Highways & SuDS Support
- Comments received from Anglian Water
- Comments received from Bourne Town Council - Objection
- Comments received from Environmental Protection
- Comments received from Black Sluice Inland Drainage Board
- Comments received from Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue
- Comments received from Environment Agency
- Comments received from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
- Comments received from Heritage Lincolnshire (Archaeology)

Councillor Charmaine Mogan declared she was approached by the Ward Councillor to accept the call-in for the application. She declared she had no interest in the application and was completely open-minded.

The following comments were made by the public speaker:

- The Ward Councillor raised concerns around residents' comments around traffic issues around the village of Dyke and the bridge.
- Concern was raised around nesting owls close to the site. It would be preferred if any construction period could take place outside of owl breeding season.
- Potential of light pollution was raised.
- The application was within open countryside.
- It was noted that benefits around employment and a low impact activity for the community.
- The Applicant was community focused for Bourne.
- The project presented years of planning, working in conjunction with partners and consultants to ensure the application was environmentally responsible, economically and socially viable.
- The facility would be a top-quality driving range technology with indoor simulators and family friendly miniature golf, all designed to make the sport accessible to everyone.
- The application had been positively supported by Golf England.
- The proposal would use less than 1/5 of an existing field with the majority remaining as open grassland, enhanced with native planting and hedgerow restoration.
- A sensitive directional lighting strategy had been provided to use low spill LED technology. All lighting would be fully shielded and contained within the site boundaries.
- There had been no objections from Highways on the application in terms of traffic.
- The application would provide jobs and open career paths.

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

- How many jobs the proposal would provide.

It was confirmed the golfing range would provide 8 jobs to start with and it was hoped to expand in the future.

- Whether 250 people were expected to visit the club in one day. It was noted there were only 70 parking spaces available.

The applicant felt 70 parking spaces would be sufficient for visitors and staff throughout each day. The applicant clarified that the number of visitors referred to was an estimate for each day overall, not at any given time.

- Clarification was sought around the operational hours.

The anticipated operational hours were anticipated to be around 10am-7/8pm. Lighting would only be utilised in winter months, when required.

- A query was raised on the use of the clubhouse.

The clubhouse would be used solely by driving range users to access snack/drink facilities.

It was clarified the indoor facilities were indoor golf booths used via technology.

The golfing range would provide club hire for the mini-golf and members would be able to hire a single club so that the facility is accessible to all.

- A query was raised around security and lighting of the facility.

There would be minimal security lighting with bollard lower level lighting to minimise any impact.

It was envisaged for the club to be open every day, including normal bank holidays.

- A query was raised on whether the land was suitable for golfing, with it being agricultural.

The applicant confirmed the driving range would have mats for people to hit off and the agricultural ground was in a good condition.

- One Member commented on the 10am opening time and felt that was too late to open for golfers.

The applicant confirmed that noise had to be taken into consideration alongside time for the team to collect the golf balls from the field.

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

- One Member suggested conditioning operational hours from 8am-8pm.

It was confirmed this could be reviewed within a management plan prior to operation of the site. The Committee could have oversight of the condition, if they felt necessary.

It was requested that a construction management plan included specific details of ecological measures, including appropriate lighting, during the phase which included the protection of species e.g. owls and bats.

### **Final decision**

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to 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 planning application form, and with the following list of approved plans:

Site Plan 1:1250 Drawing No. STWNBOUR\_0001 A111 7  
Site Plan 1:500 Drawing No. STWNBOUR\_0001 A110 8  
Ground Floor Layout Drawing No. STWNBOUR\_0001 A100 5  
External Elevations Drawing No. STWNBOUR\_0001 A400 4  
Sections Drawing No. STWNBOUR\_0001 A300

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.

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

### **Before the Development is Commenced**

- 3 Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, details demonstrating how the proposed building would comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policy SB1 must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of how carbon dioxide emissions would be minimised through the design and construction of the buildings; details of water efficiency and the provision of electric car charging points.

The approved sustainable building measures shall be completed in full, in accordance with the agreed scheme, prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure the development mitigates and adapts against climate change in accordance with Local Plan Policy SB1.

- 4 No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for archaeological works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The WSI shall be informed by the results of the

archaeological trial trench evaluation and shall provide for an appropriate programme of archaeological mitigation, which may include targeted excavation, strip-map-record, or other proportionate archaeological works, together with provision for post-excavation analysis, reporting and archiving.

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to provide a reasonable opportunity to record the history of the site and in accordance with Policy EN6 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan and the NPPF (section 16).

- 5 Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, details of hard landscaping works shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include:
- i. proposed finished levels and contours;
  - ii. means of enclosure;
  - iii. car parking layouts;
  - iv. other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
  - v. hard surfacing materials;
  - vi. minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc.);
  - vii. proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports etc.);
  - viii. retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.

Reason: Hard landscaping and tree planting make an important contribution to the development and its assimilation with its surroundings and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

### **During Building Works**

- 6 The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with a Construction Management Plan and Method Statement that shall first be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan and Statement shall indicate measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of vehicle activity and the means to manage the drainage of the site during the construction stage of the permitted development. It shall include;
- the phasing of the development to include access construction;
  - the on-site parking of all vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
  - the on-site loading and unloading of all plant and materials;
  - the on-site storage of all plant and materials used in constructing the development; - wheel washing facilities;

- the routes of construction traffic to and from the site including any off-site routes for the disposal of excavated material and;
- strategy stating how surface water run off on and from the development will be managed during construction and protection measures for any sustainable drainage features. This should include drawing(s) showing how the drainage systems (temporary or permanent) connect to an outfall (temporary or permanent) during construction.
- details of the ecological avoidance, mitigation and protective measures to be implemented before and during the construction phase, including but not necessarily limited to, the following:

- (i) Identification of ecological protection areas/buffer zones and tree root protection areas and details of physical means of protection, e.g. protection fencing.
- (ii) Working method statements for protected/priority species, such as nesting birds, reptiles, roosting bats, and badgers.
- (iii) Full details/measures to mitigate any impact on Local Wildlife Site-Dyke Fen Drain
- (iv) Details of any external lighting during the construction phase adjacent to identified ecological protection areas/buffer zones.

Reason: In the interests of the safety and free passage of those using the adjacent public highway and to ensure that the permitted development is adequately drained without creating or increasing flood risk to land or property adjacent to, or downstream of, the permitted development during construction and in the interests of ecological protection.

- 7 The development shall not commence until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (the HMMP)], prepared in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan and including:
- a) a non-technical summary;
  - (b) the roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the (HMMP)
  - (c) the planned habitat creation and enhancement works to create or improve habitat to achieve the biodiversity net gain in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan;
  - (d) the management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan for a period of 30 years from the completion of development; (could be occupation)and
  - (e) the monitoring methodology and frequency in respect of the created or enhanced habitat to be submitted to the local planning authority, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (and policy EN2).

### **Before the Development is Occupied**

- 8 Prior to first occupation on site further details relating to the vehicular access to the public highway, including materials, specification of works and construction method shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

The approved details shall be implemented on site before the development is first occupied and thereafter retained at all times.

Reason: In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway and the safety of the users of the site.

- 9 The permitted development shall be undertaken in accordance with a surface water drainage scheme which shall first have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall:

- be based on the results of evidenced groundwater levels and seasonal variations (e.g. via relevant groundwater records or on-site monitoring in wells, ideally over a 12-month period);
- be based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development;
- provide flood exceedance routing for storm event greater than 1 in 100 year;
- provide details of how run-off will be safely conveyed and attenuated during storms up to and including the 1 in 100 year critical storm event, with an allowance for climate change, from all hard surfaced areas within the development into the existing local drainage infrastructure and watercourse system without exceeding the run-off rate for the undeveloped site;
- provide attenuation details and discharge rates which shall be restricted to an agreed amount of litres per second;
- provide details of the timetable for and any phasing of implementation for the drainage scheme; and
- provide details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed over the lifetime of the development, including any arrangements for adoption by any public body or Statutory Undertaker and any other arrangements required to secure the operation of the drainage system throughout its lifetime.

No part of the development shall be occupied until the approved scheme has been completed or provided on the site in accordance with the approved phasing. The approved scheme shall be retained and maintained in full, in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the permitted development is adequately drained without creating or increasing flood risk to land or property adjacent to, or downstream of, or upstream of, the permitted development.

- 10 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the amended section plan by Studio Twenty [ref: STWNBOUR\_0001 A300, dated 26 November 2025] and the submitted flood risk assessment by Urban Water [ref: U0637 FRA-v1, dated June 2025] with the following mitigation measures it details:

- Finished floor levels of the driving range and entrance lobby shall be set no lower than 3.95m above Ordnance Datum (AOD)
- Finished floor levels of the remainder of the building shall be set no lower than 4.6m above Ordnance Datum (AOD)
- Flood resilience and resistance measures to be incorporated into the proposed development as stated in sections 6.9 – 6.15 of the FRA.

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation of the building and subsequently shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants in line with Policy EN 5 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.

- 11 No building works which comprise the erection of a building requiring to be served by water services shall be commenced unless and until full details of a scheme for the disposal of foul drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (“the Approved Foul Drainage Scheme”). The development shall proceed in accordance with the Approved Foul Drainage Scheme.

There shall be no occupation of buildings approved by this permission unless and until the Approved Foul Drainage Scheme has been completed.

Reason To ensure protection of the water environment, and to meet the objectives of the Water Framework Directive as set out in the Anglian River Basin Management Plan and to ensure compliance with Policy EN 4 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.

- 12 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied / brought into use, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include:

Long term design objectives  
Management responsibilities; and  
Maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas,

A plan specifying the location and type of integral bird nesting features (including for swifts) and bat roosting features to be provided. Numbers to be provided in line with best practice guidelines.

A plan distinguishing land required to meet mitigation and BNG objectives.

A plan specifying features to be provided to promote other protected species/non-protected species as outlined within the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (May 2025) Opportunities for Enhancement including but not limited to hedgehog shelters, insect hotels.

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Soft landscaping/ecological improvements makes an important contribution to the development and its assimilation with its surroundings; and in accordance with Policy EN2 of the adopted Local Plan.

- 13 Notwithstanding the submitted lighting report, details of any external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the use hereby permitted takes place] [and] [the building(s) is/are occupied]. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development and to ensure no unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area or the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

- 14 Before any construction work above ground is commenced, details of soft landscaping works shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include:

- i. planting plans;
- ii. written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment);
- iii. schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate;

Reason: Soft landscaping and tree planting make an important contribution to the development and its assimilation with its surroundings and in accordance with Policies DE1, EN3 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

- 15 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied/brought into use, the external elevations shall have been completed using only the materials stated in the planning application forms unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

- 16 Before the end of the first planting/seeding season following the occupation/first use of any part of the development hereby permitted, all soft landscape works shall have been carried out in accordance with the approved soft landscaping details.

Reason: Soft landscaping and tree planting make an important contribution to the development and its assimilation with its surroundings and in accordance with Policies DE1, EN3 and OS1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

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

- o Hours of operation
- o Days of operation
- o Hours of lighting operation
- o Maximum number of customers on site at any one time.

Thereafter, the development shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the approved Site Operational Management Plan.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area, and in accordance with Policy DE1 and EN2 of the adopted Local Plan.

### **On-going Conditions**

- 17 Monitoring reports shall be submitted to the local planning authority in writing in accordance with the methodology and frequency specified in the approved (HMMP).

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (and policy EN2).

- 18 Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Parts 3 and 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the premises shall only be used for the purposes specified below and for no other purpose, unless Planning Permission for a new use of the premises has been granted by the Local Planning Authority:

- Golf driving range

Reason: The use of the premises for any other purpose at this location would require further assessment by the Local Planning Authority.

The clubhouse and outdoor seating area hereby permitted shall only be used for ancillary purposes by persons using the driving range and/or miniature golf.

Reason: To define the permission, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of sustainable development.

*(Councillors Tim Harrison, Helen Crawford and Paul Fellows left the meeting at 17:15).*

## 99. Application S25/2401

<b>Proposal:</b>	Gabion structural support of existing retaining wall with repairs/rebuilding of existing buttress walls
<b>Location:</b>	Car Park, Scotgate, Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2YB
<b>Recommendation:</b>	To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036, Stamford Neighbourhood Plan and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- No comments received from Lincolnshire County Council Highways.
- No comments received from Parish Council
- No comments received from Historic England
- Comments received from SKDC Conservation Officer

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

- How many of the currently suspended car parking slots would be installed.

The entirety of the bays next to the wall were currently blocked off due to the structure. It was proposed all bays would be back to full use.

### **Final decision**

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to 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. Location Plan – Date received: 11/12/2025.
  - ii. Schedule of Works- Date received: 12/12/2025.

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.

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

## During Building Works

- 3) Before any of the works on the external elevations for the development hereby permitted are begun, samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy DE1 and EN6 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

## 100. Application S25/1526

<b>Proposal:</b>	Outline application for a residential development (7 dwellings) with all matters reserved except for access
<b>Location:</b>	Constables Field, Belton Lane, Manthorpe, Grantham
<b>Recommendation:</b>	To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to **DEFER** this item to the next meeting.

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

There were none.

## 102. Close of meeting

The Chairman closed the meeting at 17:22.

This page is intentionally left blank