

# Minutes

## Planning Committee

Thursday, 19 March 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 Pam Byrd  
Councillor Helen Crawford  
Councillor Paul Fellows  
Councillor Tim Harrison  
Councillor Gloria Johnson  
Councillor Vanessa Smith  
Councillor Sarah Trotter  
Councillor Paul Wood

### Cabinet Members present

Councillor Paul Stokes (Deputy Leader of the Council)  
Councillor Phil Dilks (Cabinet Member for Planning)

### Other Members present

Councillor Murray Turner  
Councillor Ian Stokes  
Councillor Paul Martin  
Councillor Matt Bailey  
Councillor Gareth Knight

### Officers

Graham Kitchen (Director of Law and Governance)  
Emma Whittaker (Assistant Director for Planning and Growth)  
Phil Jordan (Development Management and Enforcement Manager)  
Adam Murray (Principal Development Management Planner)  
Kevin Cartwright (Senior Planning Officer)  
Hannah Noutch (Development Management Planner)  
Craig Dickinson (Development Management Planner)  
Arianne Buschmann (Conservation Officer)  
Sean Davies (Tree Officer – Planning)  
Joshua Mann (Democratic Services Officer)  
Amy Pryde (Democratic Services Officer)  
Martha Rees (Legal Advisor)

---

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Patsy Ellis, Harrish Bisnauthsing, Vanessa Smith and Mark Whittington.

Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing was substituted by Councillor Max Sawyer.

Councillor Vanessa Smith would join the meeting at 1pm.

### 104. Disclosure of interests

Councillor Helen Crawford disclosed an interest in application S25/2443, stating that she previously knew a public speaker in a professional capacity but was addressing the application with an open mind.

It was confirmed that there were no exempt papers for the morning session.

The Chairman gave the following statement regarding applications S25/2462, S25/2223, S25/2444 and S25/2282:

'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.'

The Chairman declared an interest on applications S25/2444 and S24/2218, as a Member of Grantham Town Council. She would remain open minded when considering the application.

### 105. Minutes of the meeting held on 19 February 2026

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 February 2026 were proposed, seconded and **AGREED** as a correct record.

### 106. Application S25/1526

**Proposal:** Outline application for a residential development (7 dwellings) with all matters reserved except for access

**Location:** Constables Field, Belton Lane, Manthorpe, Grantham

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

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Design Guidelines for Rutland and South Kesteven Supplementary Planning Document.
- Comments received from the Parish Council.
- Comments received from Highways and SuDs.
- Comments received from Environmental Protection.
- No comments received from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.
- No comments received from Anglian Water.
- Comments received from Environment Agency.

The following comments were made by the public speakers:

- The District Ward Councillor raised concern around the access to the site which appeared to be too close to the railway bridge on Belton Lane. The speed limit on this road is currently 60mph and drivers often exceed this going over the bridge.
- Further concern was raised that LCC Highways had not raised any objections particularly with the current lack of a footpath for pedestrian use.
- The area has already had significant development approved and he urged the committee refuses the application on the basis of overdevelopment on the country road.

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

- It was confirmed that there was 155 meters from the access point to the bridge. Highways advised a minimum visibility distance of 124 meters in which a vehicle could safely stop from 60mph. Some Members noted concern about the safety of the access point given the speed of the road and whether there was sufficient stopping distance. A Member did note that the access point had previously been used for slow-moving tractors to access the agricultural site.
- The suggestion was made for a speed reduction of the relevant section of Belton Lane, and/or electronic speed awareness devices. It was noted that this was not within the remit of SKDC but the suggestion would be relayed to Lincolnshire County Council.
- Clarification was sought about whether a pedestrian footpath could be conditioned. It was confirmed that provisions were included for a 2-meter-wide footpath, as recommended by the Highways Authority. The exact position of the footpath was to be confirmed but would be the

most appropriate option covered by the condition. Concern was noted by some Members about whether there would be sufficient connectivity from the site on foot.

- Reassurance was sought that the layout, scale and appearance of the development could not be retrospectively changed following the award of planning permission. The Planning Officer confirmed that this would require a separate application and the application before Members was purely to determine the appropriateness of the site for the potential of 7 dwellings.
- It was noted a comprehensive layout, scale, and appearance of the site had not been presented to the committee despite being received by the Planning Officers. This was because whilst the plans satisfied officers that the site could facilitate 7 dwellings, the Planning Officers felt the layout of the site could be improved.
- A Member noted that a previous application on the site had been rejected. The Planning Officer responded that there had been a sufficient change of circumstances given that the Manthorpe Road development had been permitted.
- A member pointed out that connectivity to the Manthorpe Road estate would depend on a third party who were not part of the application.
- In reference to section 6.1516 of the report, clarification was sought about the nature of the contaminated land classification. The Planning Officer confirmed that this was the standard classification given on land previously used for agricultural purposes.

### **Final decision**

Given some Members safety concerns about the access point to the site, it was proposed, seconded, and **AGREED**, following the Chairman's casting vote, to **DEFER** the item, pending further information about the safety of the access point and connectivity of the site including details of the proposed public footpath on Belton Lane.

*The meeting adjourned at 11.07, and resumed at 11.18.*

## **107. Application S25/2443**

**Proposal:** New farm access track across field to new barn

**Location:** Toll House Farm, Farm Land Adjacent To Mill House, Bourne Road, Folkingham, NG34 0HA

**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

Cllr Murray Turner

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011-2036 and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- Comments received from Folkingham Parish Council.
- Comments received from Lincolnshire County Council (Highways & SuDS).
- Comments received from National Gas Transmission.
- Comments received from Heritage Lincolnshire.

The following comments were made by the public speakers:

The District Ward Councillor noted that both the County Councillor, the Parish Council, and 11 objectors had expressed the desire to find an alternative solution, labelling the current application as evasive.

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

- Noting that the track had already been installed, the speaker queried whether the width of the track was excessive for the stated purpose. A Member suggested that the width of the track had been to allow for wider trailers and transporting equipment.

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

- It was confirmed that the barn had been used for agricultural uses only.
- A Member expressed frustration that the individual had not sought planning permission before building the track.
- It was noted that the track could be seen from Folkingham market square.
- It was queried whether the applicant had offered to reduce the width of the track in order to secure planning permission. The Planning Officer confirmed that there had been an email thread where this had been suggested but this was not an amendment within the application.
- It was suggested that a landscaping condition was included, should the application be approved, that replacement hedge rows would be installed at the entrance to the track subject to consideration by the relevant professional. A Member did suggest that this would impair visibility. It was agreed that the location of any replacement landscaping/hedging would be with the recommendation of officers who would take such matters into account.

## **Final decision**

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

### **Approved Plans**

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans:
  - i. TOLL HOUSE FARM - FARM TRACK LAYOUT 001 – received 09/02/26
  - ii. TOLL HOUSE FARM - FARM TRACK LAYOUT 002 - received 09/02/26
  - iii. LOCATION PLAN – received 18/12/25

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this consent.

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

### **During Building Works**

2. No development hereby permitted shall commence until a written scheme of archaeological investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter, the proposed archaeological investigations shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation before works are re-commenced.

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 Paragraph 199 of the NPPF

3. Before any further works are 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 and EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

4. Before the end of the first planting/seeding season following the first use of any part of the development hereby permitted, all soft landscaping 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 and EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

## 108. Application S25/2462

**Proposal:** Repair 4 Oak supporting posts to the roof canopy after stripping off existing Collyweston roof slates. The slates are to be cleaned and reinstated once the works to the timber structure have been completed

**Location:** Land Off Of Elm Avenue, Witham On The Hill

**Recommendation:** To authorise the Assistant Director for Planning & Growth to GRANT listed building consent subject to conditions

Together with:

- Provisions within South Kesteven Local Plan 2011-2016, Design Guidelines for Rutland and South Kesteven Supplementary Planning Document and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- No comments received from Historic England.
- Comments received from Witham on The Hill Parish Council.

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

- The lifespan of the repairs was queried. The Planning Officer confirmed that this couldn't be explicitly determined but general maintenance would be required to extend the lifespan of the repairs.
- A member queried what finish the replacement timbers would have given the character of the existing timbers. The Conservation Officer advised that the timbers would not be treated but would be expected to age naturally and quite quickly gain a weathered finish. The officer also advised that the existing timbers were not the original timbers.

### **Final decision**

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director for Planning & Growth to **GRANT** listed building consent subject to conditions:

### **Time Limit for Commencement**

1 The works hereby consented shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: In order to ensure that the works are commenced in a timely manner, as set out in Sections 18 and 74 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

### **Approved Plans**

2 The works hereby consented shall be carried out in accordance with the following list of approved plans and reports:

- i) Location Plan, received 28 January 2026
  - ii) Witham on the Hill Design and Access Statement, received 28 January 2026
  - iii) Methodology of Works received 03 February 2026
- 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 commencement of any of the joinery works hereby consented, full details of all proposed joinery works for the splice repair and any additional joinery required, including 1:20 sample elevations and 1:2 joinery profiles, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory preservation of this listed building and in accordance with Policy EN6 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

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

4 Before the part of the building being altered is first occupied/brought into use, the repair of the canopy shall have been completed in accordance with the approved method statement and material.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory preservation of this listed building and in accordance with Policy EN6 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

5 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 and approved documents unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

## **109. Application S25/2223**

*The presentations for applications S25/2223, S25/2444, and S25/2282 were presented on block. Questions and voting remained separate.*

**Proposal:** Lateral crown reduction to Oak tree (TPO-356)

**Location:** Land Adjacent To Numbers 11-21 (Odd Numbers), Rosemary Avenue, Market Deeping, PE6 8JY

**Recommendation:** To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to GRANT Consent, subject to conditions

Together with:

- No representations received

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

- It was confirmed neighbours could not remove overhanging tree branches if the tree was subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).
- Concern was raised at the overall shape of the tree in view of the proposed works. Officers advised this would be taken into account when works completed.

### **Final decision**

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to **GRANT** Consent, subject to conditions:

1. All works should be completed within two years of the date of this notice.
2. All works should be carried out in accordance with the British Standard BS 3998:2010 – Tree Work-Recommendations.

## **110. Application S25/2444**

**Proposal:** Remove Sycamore tree, Mulberry tree and Weeping Ash tree (TPO-188)

**Location:** St Wulfram's Church, Church Street, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6SR

**Recommendation:** To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to GRANT Consent, subject to conditions

Together with:

- No representations received

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

- A Member expressed concern about adding trees to an already condensed area and believed the decision to replace removed trees should be with the Tree Officer.
- A member commented that TPO trees should be replaced in view of the historic importance and high profile of the site to retain its character. The Tree Officer agreed and advised that replacement trees could be placed anywhere on site and not necessarily in the vicinity of the area where the trees were removed. The tree officer also commented that they had observed a succession planting scheme would benefit the site having identified many of the trees are of a similar age. The committee were advised that this would be a decision of the committee. The Chair put this to the committee and it was agreed that a succession plan would be included in the final decision.

### **Final decision**

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to **GRANT** Consent, subject to conditions:

1. All works should be completed within two years of the date of this notice.
2. All works should be carried out in accordance with the British Standard BS 3998:2010 – Tree Work-Recommendations.

The TPO trees lost due to the works will be replaced on site in an appropriate location and a succession planting scheme will be provided to protect the character of the site.

### **111. Application S25/2282**

**Proposal:** Lateral reduction and shorten upper most leaders of Tree A, Selective pruning to provide clearance on Tree B (TPO-190)

**Location:** Land North Of Main Road, (Between Greystones And No.1 West Road), Tallington, Stamford, PE9 4RS

**Recommendation:** To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to GRANT Consent, subject to conditions

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

District Ward Councillor

Cllr Vanessa Smith (Statement)

Together with:

- No representations received

The following comments were made by the public speakers:

- The Ward Councillor for Tallington had no concerns about the application. Work to the trees had been requested by residents. They were supportive of what was being proposed.

### **Final decision**

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to **GRANT** Consent, subject to conditions:

1. All works should be completed within two years of the date of this notice.
2. All works should be carried out in accordance with the British Standard BS 3998:2010 – Tree Work-Recommendations.

*The meeting adjourned at 12:04 until 1pm.*

## **112. Application S24/2218**

**The afternoon session commenced at 1pm.**

*Councillor Vanessa Smith joined the meeting at 1pm.*

*It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to give Committee Members 10 minutes recess to read and review the exempt agenda supplement.*

Councillor Tim Harrison and Max Sawyer felt as if they had not received sufficient time to review and consider the information within the exempt agenda supplement.

The Legal Advisor advised if Members felt they had insufficient information to determine the application; they should not participate in the vote as this could bring the decision of the Council into disrepute.

*It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to give Committee Members a further 10-minute recess to read and review the exempt agenda supplement.*

*It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to go into closed session to seek clarification of the exempt papers:*

*‘Under Section 100(a)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public may be excluded from the meeting during any listed items of business, on the grounds that if they were to be present, exempt information could be disclosed to them as defined in paragraph 5 of Part 1 Schedule 12A of the Act’.*

*(The Committee returned into open session at 14:22).*

**Proposal:** 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 Matt Bailey Cllr Paul Martin Cllr Ben Green (Statement to be read out) Cllr Gareth Knight Cllr Ian Stokes
Against	Cllr Richard Davies (Grantham North-West LCC Councillor) Linda Jackson (Barrowby Gate Grantham Town Councillor)
On behalf of the Applicant	Darren Ridout – Development Manager (Buckminster)

Together with:

- Provisions within South Kesteven Local Plan 2011-2036, Design Guidelines for Rutland and South Kesteven Supplementary Planning Document, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and South Kesteven Local Plan Review 2021 – 2041.
- Comments received from Active Travel England.
- Comments received from Barrowby Parish Council.
- Comments received from County Councillor Paul Martin.
- Comments received from Grantham Civic Society.
- No comments received from Grantham Town Council.
- No comments received from Great Gonerby Parish Council.
- Comments received from Lincolnshire County Council (Highways & SuDS).
- Comments received from National Highways.
- No comments received from Network Rail.

The following comments were made by the District Ward Councillors:

- A list of material considerations of the application was outlined.

- Connectivity of Gonerby Hill Foot, through Poplar Farm and to Barrowby gate was suggested in order to provide the link road around the town.
- Objections from Lincolnshire County Council were outlined. A survey had been conducted where 926 of local people responded and 805 (87%) people said they wanted the road to be built.
- The bridge hits (29) within the town and A1 closures (42) annually were highlighted.
- District Ward Councillor felt the developer had let the people of Grantham and residents of Poplar Farm down after previously promising the bridge would be delivered.
- That the bridge was not an incidental feature. It formed part of the package of infrastructure that accompanied this development when permission was granted. Removing it now fundamentally altered the balance that justified the original decision.

The following comments were made by objectors:

- It was felt the changes to the S106 was not a minor amendment and was a fundamental weakening of the infrastructure package.
- Concern was raised on the provision of the sports pitch being delayed and the provision of a health centre.
- It was felt the proposal was a material reduction in what residents were promised.
- Delaying or removing the obligations to deliver the bridge would result in an unacceptable development, conflicting with NPPF paragraph 57 and the Council's Local Plan.
- An objector had attended a meeting where plans were discussed to release around 100 new-build houses onto the market in the Barrowby Gate area being significantly more than the originally suggested 30.
- Previously, an inspector's report had suggested the bridge was no longer necessary, due to the planned Southern Relief Road. But that road is designed primarily for lorries and transport heading east/west, it does not address the everyday traffic problems faced by local residents.
- For local people, the Pennine Way Bridge would not be a luxury, but a necessity.

The following comments were made by the Applicant:

- The original plan with the inclusion of the Pennine Way link was to improve connectivity across the railway to reduce traffic within the town centre.
- The Section 73 application proposes to vary the latest planning permission initially submitted in 2008 and approved in 2011.

- The application seeks the removal of the obligation to deliver the Pennine Way link whilst retaining this as part of the planning permission.
- Since conditions were put in place in the granting of the consent in 2011, there had been major infrastructure, policy and strategy changes affecting Grantham.
- In 2024, following a pre-application submission in 2020, a full and updated technical Highways Assessment was carried out, which considered the benefits of the fully approved and commenced Grantham Southern Relief Road.
- The assessment concluded that with appropriate mitigation and the completion of Grantham Southern Relief Road, the Pennine Way link would not be required.
- Highways Grantham Transport Strategy did not include the Pennine Way link and was deemed not a necessary piece of infrastructure. Grantham Southern Relief Road was due to open in 2028.
- Officers had proposed conditions to limit the development until the completion of the Grantham Southern Relief Road.
- If the link is not delivered, then the contribution secured in the 2011 S106 agreement would also be increased.
- The new S106 consent, if approved, would deliver a combined sports facility and community building, ensuring that both services are provided in the community representing a significant improvement on the current consent.

During questions to the Public Speakers, Members commented on the following:

- Further clarification was requested on how the bridge strikes and A1 closures impacted Grantham's road networks.

A District Ward Councillor noted that any closures on the A1 meant that any vehicles would be diverted through Grantham high street. The bridges were a 'pinch point' meaning with no link road, any residents of Poplar or Rectory Farm would have to use a route with a bridge 'pinch point' in order to access the town.

- A query was raised on why the bridge was originally included in the Transport Strategy for Grantham.

In 1988, the main reason for the bridge to be installed was to connect the communities together.

- Clarification was sought round the £20bn infrastructure and the need for the road. It was queried whether any funding had been put forward by LCC or any public body.

It was confirmed there was no other funding available for the road and it was developer only.

There was £4m originally accounted for in the viability appraisal for the cost of the bridge alone. There was additional monies that needed to be accounted for in terms of the payment required to cover the ransom strip held by network rail.

The timeframe for the delivery of the bridge was 750 occupations, which was considered the earliest point it was considered that the development could afford to deliver the bridge via sufficient receipts from the houses sold.

- Whether the bridge, if erected, would put pressure on the Belton Lane junction.
- Connectivity concerns were addressed and it was queried whether the bridge could also impact other areas of the town including Earlesfield and Harlaxton.

The Public Speaker outlined several roads within Grantham that were impacted by regular A1 closures or bridge strikes, the bridge would assist in relieving some traffic issues within these areas.

- Clarification was sought on anecdotal evidence on how frequent accidents occurred on the A1.

The District Councillor felt there were often issues relating to the A52 or the A1 at least once a day.

- A Member requested the general consensus of opinion for the bridge as an adjacent Ward Councillor.

It was felt that many residents were in favour of the bridge in order to future-proof the town.

- A query was raised on whether the Applicant had in fact failed to deliver the playpark and sport pitch on this site.

An objector stated the Applicant had failed to deliver the playpark, failed on upkeeping green spaces and lacked overall maintenance of the site.

- Clarification was sought around closures on the A1 and how it impacted Grantham as a whole.

An objector confirmed when the application was reviewed in 2022, it was found that the A1 was closed at least once a fortnight between Stamford and Blyth, for around half a day on average. In 2026, closures were now occurring weekly.

The Assistant Director of Planning and Growth reminded Members that questions to public speakers were merely for points of clarification from their speech.

Members were asked to disregard any comments made in regard to deliverability of the play park. There were no breaches in terms of the planning application and the Applicant was fully compliant to the planning permission and any S106 agreements.

The Legal Advisor advised the Committee to give limited weight to any anecdotal evidence.

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

- Clarification was sought on the Highways Assessment regarding how it was completed and who by.

The Applicant clarified as part of the planning application, a transport assessment was undertaken by a consultant. This was the assessment referred to in the Applicant's speech and its findings had been supported by Lincolnshire County Council Highways.

Transport modelling could only be completed once schemes were committed and underway. The 2024 transport assessment takes into account the Grantham Southern Relief Road.

- One Member queried how many formal meetings had taken place between Network Rail and the Applicant on the bridge design and delivery.

The individual speaking on behalf of Buckminster had only been with the company for a year, and therefore, could not comment on how many formal meetings had taken place.

- Further clarification was sought from Highways position and concerns. They had requested robust evidence to fully understand the impact on their own network.

The Applicant clarified Highways did not raise any objections on Highways safety or capacity. The objection from them was in relation to active travel.

The Principal Development Management Planner clarified the comments outlined by Lincolnshire County Council in the report recognised they were engaged in pre-application conversations with the Applicant back in 2020 around the potential to remove the obligations to deliver the bridge. At that point, they advised there were three reasons for the bridge being required:

- Capacity relating to the impact of the traffic.

- Connectivity relating to connections between Poplar Farm and Great Gonerby.
- To provide a secondary link into Poplar Farm.

Lincolnshire County Council were satisfied with the proposal and that the removal of the obligations to deliver the bridge would not have an unacceptable impact on capacity. There would be additional links into Poplar Farm via Rectory Farm, which was not the case in 2020.

- Whether a detailed engineering design for the bridge had been prepared, when it was produced and whether it had been shared with Network Rail.

The Applicant confirmed an engineering design for the bridge had been prepared and discussed with Network Rail.

- One Member queried whether the Applicant's could afford to build the bridge. The Applicant stated they could afford to build the bridge. However, the Applicant's highlighted the bridge was no longer required and the money could be utilised elsewhere.
- It was noted the bridge was still required from an active travel perspective. It was queried whether the Applicant's had considered other options to mitigate the impact on active travel.

The Applicant confirmed a variety of solutions had been explore on active travel routes, however, most routes still crossed the railway and encounter the same ransom positions with Network Rail.

- How the traffic from the completed development which will include vehicles from another 1,100 houses will be distributed if the connection is removed.
- Clarification was sought that if the application was approved, would the Applicant's commit to constructing the bridge voluntarily without a legal obligation.

The traffic assessment would have reviewed traffic distribution from the scheme. It was felt a greater proportion of traffic would have been leaving via Barrowby Road rather than going over the Pennine Way link. Therefore, the proportion of traffic being added to Barrowby Road was not the full 1,100 homes because some of those movements were already modelled to use Barrowby Road.

*(Councillor Sarah Trotter left the meeting at 15:50, she did not return).*

- Whether the potential for the road link would remain. Reassurance was sought on whether the layout provided retains the link from Poplar Farm to the railway.

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

- Whether the bridge or the road for the bridge would remain on the site.

The Principal Development Management Planner noted the planning permission was accompanied by a master plan, which outlined the bridge link and was not being changed as part of this permission. Any reserved matters application for the remainder of the site would need to be in compliance with that master plan for the bridge to come forward.

*(The Committee had an adjournment from 15:55-16:05).*

- That National Highways and Lincolnshire County Council had required robust evidence and had recommended refusal or requested further information

Comments received from National Highways around modelling related to the matter of timing in terms of the number of occupations that could be delivered on Poplar Farm before the A1/A52 junction improvements needed to be completed. This had been restricted to 750 occupations, which had already been accepted by an appeal Inspector as a suitable position.

Lincolnshire County Council (Highways) comments had accepted the capacity issue from their perspective alongside the safety issue. In terms of connectivity, the test was around whether it was necessary to mitigate the impact of the development.

- It was queried when the Council were notified of the Applicant's being in contact with Network Rail alongside when the detailed plan of the bridge was sent to the Council.

The Principal Development Management Planner confirmed whether the Applicant had complied with the S106 agreement was not part of the application being considered.

The Council were not directly notified of any communication taking place between the Applicant and Network Rail. The Council were not provided with the quarterly updates that were agreed. Officers had been advised that the negotiations did take place up until 2020, and the conversations did involve a bridge design and exploring contractors to undertake the works.

- That the development was originally approved on the basis that a railway bridge connection was implemented. It was also deemed at that time that it was needed to put a S106 to ensure the works were completed.

The Principal Development Management Planner noted there were no records outlining the bridge was a primary objective and the housing was secondary objective. The application granted in 2011 recognises the site as a mixed-use urban extension and a growth direction for Grantham for housing.

- Further clarification was sought on why the bridge was not necessary but desirable.

The policy context in which Highways matters were assessed when the bridge was originally imposed was a different context. The policy in terms of the NPPF at present was around mitigating the Highways impact as a severity test. When the bridge was provided as part of planning permission for Poplar Farm, the Highway's authority policy position was that if a development takes up 50 cars worth of capacity on the highways network, they would have to provide alternative capacity to mitigate that impact, regardless of whether or not the Highway could accommodate that number of vehicles.

In terms of capacity, the Grantham Southern Relief Road was designed to remove through traffic from the town centre. If the roads within the town centre were at 100% capacity, the relief road by diverting some of the traffic would remove 20% of that capacity. By removing this the obligation to deliver the bridge on Poplar Farm, only uses that spare capacity because all of the modelling and assessments was that those vehicles are already on the network.

The modelling for the original permission expected vast majority of movements to be going down Barrowby Road. It was believed the Pennine Way link would only have relieved a small amount of distribution of traffic going down Barrowby Road.

*It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to **EXTEND** the meeting until 5:30pm.*

- Members highlighted the fact Lincolnshire County Council Highways had strongly objected to the proposal.
- Whether traffic would be pushed back on Belton Lane, if the bridge was to go ahead.

The Principal Development Management Planner clarified it was likely the traffic would be pushed back onto Belton Lane junction depending on where people were travelling to and from.

- One Member highlighted comments made by Grantham Civic Society on the relocation of the diagnostic centre.
- Members felt there were strong reasons to refuse the application and also discussed possible outcomes if the development stopped which would result in the loss of the promised community centre, doctors surgery and playing fields.

- It was highlighted the Applicant had stated in the speech that they could afford to build the bridge; however, they surmised it wasn't necessary.
- Concern was raised that there was only one access road into the estate.

It was clarified there was currently a singular point of access serving Poplar Farm, however, there was secondary points of access via Rectory Farm. With this in mind, there were 4 routes in total between Poplar Farm and Rectory Farm onto Barrowby Road. A member pointed out that the routes all ended up on Barrowby Road if the bridge was not provided and that Barrowby Road is known to be very congested.

A member stated that Rectory Farm would not have any target destinations for residents of Poplar Farm.

The Committee were reminded that removing the obligation would not remove the potential of the bridge being delivered. They should consider whether it was necessary for this developer to provide the bridge. It was agreed however that without the requirement of the applicant to build the bridge it would be unlikely to be delivered.

The Assistant Director of Planning and Growth outlined the site was allocated and was proposed in the emerging Local Plan. If the Council were challenged around the deliverability of the site as a future development (if the permission lapsed or did not come further forward), this could undermine the emerging plan and the Council would need to find 1,100 other homes elsewhere in Grantham.

- One Member highlighted the ransom strip, which the Council did not have any control over. Network Rail would need to agree as the private landowner for any bridge to be built.
- One Member suggested whether the Applicant could explore how much Network Rail may charge for access to the ransom strip.
- It was queried what level of development would cause the least harm to the communities.

It was clarified that connectivity would still be important whether there was 0 or 750 homes. At 750 homes, the development was considered to be able to afford the scheme. The evidence within the report suggested that the Highways Network can accommodate the additional vehicle movements.

If Members were concerned that the bridge was even feasible however, felt it was desirable and beneficial to have. The Committee had an option to defer the application to allow for financial viability of the bridge to be explored further.

A new S106 agreement would cover the additional contributions that arise from the development. Therefore, if the Committee refuse the application

without that S106 agreement being completed at this stage, it would be appropriate for an additional reason for refusal on the basis of no S106 agreement to secure the infrastructure improvement.

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

‘The removal of the obligation to deliver the Pennine Way link road bridge would significantly and demonstrably undermine permeability and active travel connectivity between the site and the surrounding areas without a suitable alternative point of connection being provided. This would result to harm to the permeability of the development, the attractiveness and safety of active travel options, contrary to the principles of building for healthy life and as a result of conflict with Policy DE1 and ID2 of the adopted Local Plan, adopted guidelines SPD and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and material considerations in the case including the public benefits associated with the delivery of the housing would not outweigh the identified harms and conflict with the development plan ’.

*(Councillors Tim Harrison, Max Sawyer and Paul Wood voted in favour of the proposal to refuse the application).*

This proposal fell.

- One Member queried how likely it would be that additional information on the reasons for refusal would be stronger or that there may be a better way forward for the development.

It was noted the viability process, the original estimate for the bridge was £4m in 2011. Since then, building costs had increased by 100% meaning bridge construction alone would be around £8m.

A comparable scheme had been discussed with Lincolnshire County Council in the Western Growth Point in Lincoln which had a bridge over a railway. The bridge required grant funding due to the cost of the bridge being over £20m, not accounting for any ransom strip.

The Committee were reminded of the critical nature of the reserved matter. The time to submit the reserved matters on the outline permission would expire in June 2026. The Council were in discussions with the Applicant meaning approval of the application may mean a developer would re-commence the delivery of the scheme.

### **Final decision**

It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to **DEFER** planning permission for the following reasons:

Whilst Members remain concerned that the bridge was necessary for connectivity reasons, it was felt that further information is required to allow Members to fully balance the relevant material planning considerations. As such, it was agreed to obtain further information on the following matters:

1. Evidence of the negotiations undertaken with Network Rail to obtain their approval to deliver the bridge, including any information relating to the preparation of technical designs for the bridge, correspondence in relation to the appointment of contractors to undertake the works, and evidence of negotiations regarding the ransom strip
1. Updated evidence in relation to the viability of delivering the bridge – this is to include further modelling of the viability assessment to include an updated cost of the bridge and the Network Rail ransom. This is to include testing at intervals throughout the development to understand if the bridge can be afforded at any point during the development. This will also include a further review of the Section 106 package in light of any additional development costs associated with the bridge.

*(Councillor Tim Harrison voted against the proposal to defer the application).*

*(Councillors Vanessa Smith, Gloria Johnson and Paul Wood left the meeting at 17:20, and did not return).*

### **113. Application S25/0505**

(It was proposed, seconded and **AGREED** to extend the meeting until 6pm.)

**Proposal:** Outline planning permission, with all matters reserved except for access, for commercial floorspace and industrial development providing up to 140,000 sqm total GIA of general industrial (Use Class B2) and storage and distribution (Use Class B8) floorspace with ancillary office (Use Class E(g)(i)) floorspace and supporting infrastructure including earthworks, drainage, landscaping, parking, servicing, and other associated works.

**Location:** Land south of Gorse Lane, west of A1, Grantham

**Recommendation:** To authorise the Assistant Director – Planning & Growth to GRANT planning permission, subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement

Noting comments in the public speaking session by:

Applicant

Phil Jones (Mulberry Commercial Land)

Together with:

- Provisions within SKDC Local Plan 2011 – 2036, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Design Guidelines for Rutland and South Kesteven.
- Comments received from Environmental Protection Services (SKDC).
- Comments received from LCC Highways & SuDS Support.
- Comments received from Environment Agency.
- Comments received from Anglian Water.
- Comments received from Fire Authority.
- Comments received from National Highways.
- No comments received from Newark and Sherwood District Council.
- Comments received from Active Travel England (ATE).
- Comments received from MOD Safeguarding.
- Comments received from Heritage Lincolnshire.
- Comments received from Conservation Officer.
- Comments received from Historic England.
- Comments received from Natural England.
- Comments received from Upper Witham Drainage Board.

The following comments were made by the public speaker:

- The proposal was for a significant strategic employment scheme on a key allocated site within the Local Plan.
- The site had direct access to the A1 representing a huge opportunity to invest in Grantham and the surrounding areas.
- The Applicant had previously delivered high quality and sustainable schemes.
- The proposal focused on the delivery of up to 140,000sqm of premium industrial logistics floor space.
- The socio-economic benefits were outlined.
- Once operational, the scheme would support 2,200 full time jobs which would be targeted at local residents.
- The sustainable landscape development would be designed to minimise impact on the wider environment.
- The scheme would commit to a 10% biodiversity net gain and a 1264% increase in hedgerow planting across the site.
- Extensive tree planting and habitat management protecting and enhancing key ecological features.
- The scheme supports active travel, with no further impacts on the network.
- A solution had been discussed with Anglian Water through conditions 15 and 16.
- It was noted that the site could comprise of multiple buildings which could provide opportunity for further landscaping.

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

- Whether the Applicant was confident they could meet the concerns of Anglian Water.

The Applicant clarified the outline planning application had many conditions, which would be met.

Anglian Water had recognised an under investment on the network within the area of the site. Condition 15 and 16 ensured the work would be carried out.

- Whether the Applicant would accept an additional condition to require lighting that's appropriate for protection of wildlife e.g. bats.

A lighting condition was within the Officer recommendation where a lighting scheme would need to be approved in detail. As part of the submission, relevant consultees would be consulted including the ecological professionals.

- Whether the building would be conditioned to have colour graded panelling on the roof to blend in with the skyline.

The Applicant confirmed elevations would be presented as a reserved matter. Historically on other employment buildings, the Applicant's had the graded colour scheme on each roof.

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

- Concern was raised on the timeframe on which Anglian Water may commence works on the site.
- The need to protect wildlife in view of the rural location of the site

### **Final decision**

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

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

1 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission or two years from the approval of the last of the reserved matters, whichever is the latter.

Reason: In order that the development is commenced in a timely manner, as set out in Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

## **Reserved matters**

2 Details of the reserved matters set out below shall have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval within three years from the date of this permission:

- i. layout;
- ii. scale
- iii. appearance
- iv. landscaping

Approval of all reserved matters shall have been obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

The layout and scale presented at Reserved Matters must not exceed the maximum parameters detailed within the submitted Site Parameters Plan GRN-PHP-W0-XX-DR-A-4674-007-P09.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail and in order that the development is commenced in a timely manner, as set out in Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

## **Approved Plans**

3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans:

- i) Location Plan GRN-PHP-W0-XX-DR-A-4674-009 (P02)
- ii) Proposed Site Access Arrangements Dwg. No. 2310-043 PL01 Rev. B.

Unless otherwise required by another condition of this permission.

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

## **Pre-commencement**

### **Phasing**

4 Prior to the commencement of any development, a phasing plan for the development as a whole including for the agreed access shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development, hereby approved, shall only be implemented in accordance with the approved phasing plan or other such details, which must be first submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the timely development of the works including to the site frontage, and coordination with associated highway works.

Construction Method Statement

5 No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan and Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall indicate measures to mitigate against traffic generation and drainage of the site during the construction stage of the proposed development.

The Construction Management Plan and Method Statement shall include:

- o phasing of the development to include access for construction;
- o the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- o loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- o storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- o wheel washing facilities;
- o hours of construction work including hours of deliveries;
- o full details of any piling to be employed, if relevant; and;
- o 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 (permanent or temporary) connect to an outfall (temporary or permanent) during construction.

The Construction Management Plan and Method Statement shall be strictly adhered to throughout the construction period.

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, the permitted development during construction and to ensure that suitable traffic routes are agreed.

6 No part of the development hereby permitted shall commence until a Construction Traffic Management Plan has been submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the agreed Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure a satisfactory form of development.

#### Archaeology

- 7 Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, a written scheme of archaeological investigation shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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 Paragraph 211 of the NPPF.

#### Contamination

8 Prior to the commencement of development within any phase or sub-phase (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), the following components of a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

a. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:

All previous uses

ii. Potential contaminants associated with those uses

iii. A conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors

iv. Potential unacceptable risks arising from contamination of the site.

b. A site investigation scheme, based on (i) above to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.

c. The site investigation results and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (b) above and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

d. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in (c) above are complete and identifying any requirements for longer term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. The scheme shall be carried out as approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard potential occupiers against possible harm arising from any contamination and to ensure that the potential risks posed to controlled water is assessed and surface water monitoring is undertaken consistent with the requirements of paragraph 107 of the NPPF and Policy EN2 and EN4 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

#### Off-site Access Details and Programme

9 No development, other than works required for Site preparation / Earthworks, shall commence in any phase or sub-phase until details of the following works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and no part of the development shall be occupied or brought into use until these works have been completed in accordance with the approved details.

- (i) The provision of an additional arm off the roundabout connecting to the A1 and Tollemache Road North.

- (ii) The provision of a footpath / cycleway to connect from the existing network to the site as shown indicatively on Proposed Footway/Cycle Track Dwg No. 2310-043 PL02 Rev A.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and convenience and in accordance with Policy ID2 and DE1 of the Local Plan.

#### Plot Access Details and Programme

10 No development, other than works required for Site preparation / Earthworks, shall commence in any phase or sub-phase until engineering, drainage, street lighting and other construction details required to facilitate access to that phase or sub-phase, as well as a programme for their phased implementation has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme and the phasing plan.

Reason: In the interests of traffic safety and convenience in accordance with Policies ID2 and DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

#### Travel Plan

11 Prior to first occupation of the development, a Travel Plan comprising immediate, continuing and long-term measures to promote and prioritise alternatives to private vehicular use, which shall include clear objectives and modal share targets, together with a time-bound programme of implementation, monitoring, regular review and interventions (in the event of a failure to meet modal share targets) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented, monitored and reviewed in accordance with the agreed Travel Plan measures and targets to the satisfaction of the council.

Reason: In order that the permitted development conforms to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, by ensuring that access to the site is sustainable and that there is reduced dependency on the private car for journeys to and from the development in accordance with Policy ID2 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

#### Cycle Parking

12 Prior to the commencement of development above ground of any phase or sub-phase including a building, a scheme for the provision of cycle parking within that Phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking spaces, shall be provided in

accordance with the approved scheme prior to the occupation of the phase to which they relate and shall be retained at all times.

Reason: In order that the permitted development conforms to the requirements of Policy ID2 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

#### Earthworks and Materials Management Plan

13 No development shall commence in any phase or sub-phase until an earthworks and material management plan for that phase or sub-phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: Earthworks and the creation of development platforms will involve large material volumes, and the LPA wish to be assured as satisfactory the details of site preparation works that my impact on local amenity, hydrology and ecology is addressed.

#### Surface Water Drainage

14 The permitted development shall be undertaken in accordance with a surface water drainage scheme principles set out in Burrows Graham FRA & DS ref. 30147-BGL-XX-XX-RP-D-00001 P08. For each phase of the scheme, the detailed drainage design shall be submitted to the LLFA for approval, and include the following information:

- be based on verified groundwater levels and seasonal variations, as evidenced through on-site monitoring conducted over a six-month winter 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 green field run-off rates or alternative rates as agreed by Anglian Water;
- 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, the permitted development in accordance with Policy EN5 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

#### Foul Water Drainage

15 Prior to the construction of any building above slab level pursuant to a phase or sub phase of the permission, a scheme for the on-site foul water drainage works, based on Burrows Graham FRA & DS ref. 30147-BGL-XX-XX-RP-D-00001 P08 or an alternatively agreed scheme which includes the connection point and discharge rate to the public network, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development must only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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

#### Foul Water Discharge

16 Under no circumstances will foul water be discharged from the site until the earlier of:

- The Anglian Water works upgrade works have been completed to the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) at Manthorpe Mill Pumping Station (AW Ref. AnW0862), or
- Two years following the date of this planning permission

Reason: Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory foul water drainage is provided in accordance with Policy EN5 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan and to provide Anglian Water with the opportunity to make improvements to their existing network within a reasonable timeframe.

#### Hard and Soft Landscaping

17 No development, other than works required for Site preparation / Earthworks, shall commence in any phase or sub-phase until a scheme for soft and hard landscaping for that phase or sub-phase, including for the A1 frontage and the perimeter planting, as well as on-plot hard and soft

landscaping (including boundary treatments), shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme shall be implemented prior to first occupation, or as may otherwise be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

#### Levels

18 A reserved matters application shall include plans showing the existing and proposed land levels of the site including site sections, spot heights, contours and the finished floor levels of all buildings with reference to neighbouring properties/an off site datum point shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and in accordance with Policy DE1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

### **Before the development is occupied**

#### Noise

19 Prior to the occupation of any building hereby permitted, an assessment demonstrating compliance for all building services plant with the design targets established within the ES Vol. 1 Chapter 7 (Lucion Delta-Simons) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

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

Reason: In the interests of commercial and environmental amenity in accordance with Policy EN4, DE1 and SD1 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

#### Sustainability

20 The buildings shall achieve a minimum Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) rating of at least 'Very Good' in accordance with the submitted BREEAM UK New Construction Outline Pre-Assessment (P4, 21 February 2025) prepared by MBA.

Reason: In the interests of design, safeguarding the environment and providing sustainable development and to ensure the development mitigates and adapts against climate change in accordance with Local Plan Policy SB1.

### Ecology

21 All works on site and to the buildings during construction shall be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations as set out in the Ecological Assessment and Further Ecological Assessment (BMD).

This shall include details of mitigation, compensation/enhancement as set out in the recommendations of the reports in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

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

Reason: In the interest of best ecological practice and in accordance with Policy EN2 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

### Lighting

22 Before works to erect any lightings are commenced, details of the lighting including levels of illumination and hours of operation shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting details will accord with the submitted External LED Lighting Outline Stage Assessment Report (Rev. P4) and the Estate Road External LED Lighting Assessment Report (Rev. P4), both prepared by MBA.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and in accordance with Policies EN4 and DE1 and in the interests of best ecological practice as required by Policy EN2 of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan.

### Soft Landscaping

23 Before the end of the first planting/seeding season following the occupation/first use of each phase or sub-phase of the development hereby permitted, all soft landscaping works for that phase or sub-phase 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.

### Hard Landscaping

24 Before each phase or sub-phase of the development hereby permitted is occupied/brought into use, all hard landscaping works pertaining to that

phase or sub-phase 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 conditions**

25 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.

26 The development hereby permitted shall be limited to the following uses and to the maximum floor space for each as defined by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended:

Up to 140,000 sqm total GIA of general industrial (Use Class B2) and storage and distribution (Use Class B8) floorspace with ancillary office (Use Class E(g)(i)).

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to define the permission and in order that the development is carried out in accordance with the parameters against which the application was assessed.

27 No development above ground on any phase or sub-phase requiring a non-domestic water supply shall commence until a strategic water resources strategy relating to that phase or sub-phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Anglian Water. The strategy will confirm non-domestic water is available to serve the development and should explore innovative solutions which may help reduce overall water demand.

The development must only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure domestic water supply is not jeopardised and to protect water resources and ensure sustainable development.

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

There were none.

**115. Close of meeting**

The Chairman closed the meeting at 17:55.