

Minutes of a meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding, on Wednesday, 11 March 2026 at 6.30 pm.

**PRESENT**

J Avery (Chairman)  
A C Beal (Vice-Chairman)

P Barnes  
H J W Bingham

C J T H Brewis  
A Casson

A C Tennant  
J Tyrrell

In Attendance: Group Manager – Planning and Development, Principal Planning Officer, Senior Planning Lawyer, Planning Officer and Democratic Services Officer

**53. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

The Senior Planning Lawyer reported that notification had been received of the following substitution for this meeting only:

- Councillor Barnes was replacing Councillor Alcock.

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor T Sneath and Councillor A Woolf.

**54. MINUTES**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2026.

**AGREED:**

That the minutes be signed as a correct record.

**55. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.**

There were none.

**56. QUESTIONS ASKED UNDER THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION (STANDING ORDERS).**

There were none.

**57. H02-0511-25**

**Planning No. and Applicant**  
H02-0511-25 Seagate Homes

**Proposal**  
Full application for proposed development of 9 Dwellings at Land off Postland Road, Crowland.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 March 2026**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Manager upon which the above application was to be determined, including their recommendations, copies of which had previously been circulated to all members.

Members debated the matter and fully explored the details of the application in light of prevailing policies and guidance, with the following comments being raised:

- Councillor Astill submitted comments as a ward member that were read out and highlighted that the proposal offered a rarer executive housing mix but also raised concerns around being outside the Local Plan boundary and existing Anglian Water capacity issues.
- The report was clear on the reasons for refusal and particular regard should be given to the comments of the Environment Agency.
- The proposed dwellings provided lower density; higher specification housing not typically delivered in Crowland.
- Although the proposal was outside the settlement boundary, the site felt visually enclosed by existing commercial and residential development and therefore should not be considered countryside
  - Officers noted that the red line boundary within the Local Plan determined whether a piece of land is countryside, not the built form on the ground.
- Queried whether the site could have been pursued as a rural exception site which would have allowed for a larger affordable housing scheme.
  - Officers responded that rural exception sites must meet strict criteria, particularly in demonstrating a proven local need for specific type and scale of housing.
- Noted that adjacent land already had permission for high-density housing and therefore the low-density nature of this application would provide a buffer to screen noise from the commercial uses surrounding the site.
- Approval of this application would effectively push the settlement boundary outside of that outlined in the Local Plan.
- Acceptance that the red line was important, but the scheme felt high-quality and would be preferred to other types of development.
- Queried whether the proposed site was lower than the adjacent site in terms of flood risk.
  - Officers confirmed this was the case.
- Approving an application outside the Local Plan boundary would set a precedent and could lead to a surge of applications of a similar nature.
- The application provided a better-quality layout and housing mix than other developments, despite the flood risk.

The full debate was not repeated here as a livestream of this Planning Committee Meeting could be viewed on South Holland District Council's Facebook page for a limited period of time, in line with the Democratic Services Privacy Notice.

The initial vote to refuse the application was lost. Following further debate, the vote to refuse the application was re-tabled as no alternative proposal with reasons was put forward.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 March 2026**

**AGREED:**

That the application be refused for the reasons set out at section 9.0 of the report.

(Moved by Councillor Avery, Seconded by Councillor Beal)

Oral representations were received in respect of the above application in line with the Council's scheme of public speaking at Planning Committee meetings:

**Supporter:** David Laidler (Seagate Homes) (Applicant)

58. **PLANNING APPEALS**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Manager which provided an update on recent appeal decisions.

Members were advised to contact the relevant case officer should there be any queries or points of clarity required on any of the appeal decisions included within the report.

**AGREED:**

That the report be noted.

59. **PLANNING UPDATES.**

There were none.

60. **ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT.**

There were none.

(The meeting ended at 7.20 pm)

(End of minutes)