

Minutes of a meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding, on Wednesday, 29 April 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
T Sneath
A C Tennant

J Tyrrell
A R Woolf

In Attendance: Service Director – Planning and Strategic Infrastructure, Group Manager – Planning and Development, Development Manager (Interim), Planning Consultant, Senior Planning Lawyer and Democratic Services Officer

61. **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 were received from Councillor S Hutchinson.

62. **MINUTES**

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

AGREED:

That the minutes be signed as a correct record.

63. **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.**

There were none.

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

There were none.

65. **H22-0245-26**

Planning No. and Applicant
H22-0245-26 National Grid

Proposal
Electricity application for Section 37 overhead line works on the existing 400 kV 4ZM lines in the vicinity of the Spalding Tee-Point, Surfleet Seas End and Moulton Seas End.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 April 2026

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Manager which outlined the recommended response of the Council to the Secretary of State.

Members debated the matter fully, with the following comments being raised:

- Members expressed widespread concern regarding the prematurity of the application, noting that no planning application for the proposed Weston Marsh substation had yet been submitted to, or considered by, the Planning Committee. It was felt that commenting favourably on related infrastructure ahead of the main development could risk undermining the Committee's ability to properly consider any future planning application on its merits.
- Reference was made to objections submitted by Weston Parish Council and a significant number of local residents. Particular concern was raised regarding the absence of an Environmental Impact Assessment and the potential for significant environmental effects.
- Members also highlighted the proposed use of best and most versatile (Grade 1) agricultural land, with concern expressed about the cumulative loss of high-quality farmland when considered alongside the wider Weston Marsh proposals.
- Concerns were raised regarding highways and access, particularly the suitability of Stonegate and surrounding narrow rural roads to accommodate prolonged construction traffic.
- Members also discussed the likely duration of construction works and the potential impact on local residents, farms, and tourism businesses.
- Several Members commented that the proposal formed part of a much wider infrastructure programme and that its impacts could not reasonably be assessed in isolation.
- Disappointment was expressed that the submission contained no reference to local employment, training opportunities, community benefit, or compensation for affected landowners and residents.
- Members debated the wording of the draft consultation response, with strong objection to the phrase indicating that the District Council had "no objections". It was felt this did not accurately reflect the strength of concern expressed by the Committee or the wider community.
- It was suggested that officers could present the final wording of the consultation response to the Chairman's Panel, with the Portfolio Holder and Ward Members included, to approve the response.

AGREED:

That the full consultation response, including all suggestions made by the Planning Committee, be submitted to the Chairman's Panel for approval prior to the completion of Form B and its subsequent return to the applicant.

(Moved by Councillor Woolf, Seconded by Councillor Brewis)

66. **H22-0246-26**

Planning No. and Applicant

Proposal

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 April 2026

H22-0246-26 National Grid

Electricity application for Section 37 overhead line works on the existing 400 kV 2WS lines in the vicinity of the Spalding Tee-Point, Surfleet Seas End and Moulton Seas End

This item was discussed in conjunction with the previous agenda item.

AGREED:

That the full consultation response, including all suggestions made by the Planning Committee, be submitted to the Chairman's Panel for approval prior to the completion of Form B and its subsequent return to the applicant.

(Moved by Councillor Woolf, Seconded by Councillor Brewis)

67. **H09-1109-25**

Planning No. and Applicant

H09-1109-25 Mr L Gray

Proposal

Full application for use of site as Gypsy Traveller Plot on Storage Yard – Retrospective at Ravens Gate, Holbeach St Johns, Spalding

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:

- Members expressed significant concern regarding highway safety, particularly along Ravens Gate and the wider road network towards Saturday Bridge. Reference was made to the history of serious accidents in the area and to concerns raised by Members and the public about vehicle speeds, absence of footways, and lack of public transport provision.
 - Officers confirmed that Lincolnshire County Council Highways had raised no objection to the proposal, having assessed accident data and predicted trip generation. It was explained that the purpose of a planning application was not to resolve existing highway problems, but to ensure that the development would not result in severe highway harm. Members were advised that speed limits and Traffic Regulation Orders could not be imposed through planning conditions, but that concerns could be formally passed to the Highway Authority.
- Members queried compliance with local plan policy for Gypsy/Traveller accommodation, in particular criteria relating to accessibility to services, schools, and public transport.
 - Officers acknowledged some conflict with Policy 20, criterion G but advised that, when considered in the planning balance, the proposal

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 April 2026

- was acceptable given that the overarching spatial strategy allows Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in countryside locations.
- Officers also confirmed that the Council currently does not meet its identified Gypsy and Traveller pitch need.
- Clarification was sought on the restriction on commercial activity and whether business registration would be permitted.
 - Officers advised that residential use would be acceptable, but any business activity involving visits, deliveries, or material change of use would require planning permission.
- Members queried whether the site could be expanded to include more pitches in the future.
 - Officers confirmed that any extension or additional pitches would require a new planning application, and that approval of the current proposal would not bind the Council in respect of future applications.
- Clarification was sought on the definition of a gypsy/traveller.
 - Officers confirmed that the definition was set out in national planning policy.
- Members discussed the size and use of the proposed day room, with concerns raised about its potential future use as a separate dwelling.
 - Officers advised that day rooms are a common feature of permanent traveller sites and that any use as a separate residential unit would constitute a breach of planning control and be subject to enforcement action.
- Members emphasised the importance of achieving a high-quality landscaping and boundary scheme to ensure the development integrated appropriately into the rural landscape and did not appear as a visually intrusive compound.
 - Officers confirmed that amended conditions would require details of landscaping and boundary treatments to be submitted and approved prior to occupation, with provisions for replacement planting where necessary.

Councillor Brewis requested that his vote against the application to be recorded in the minutes.

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.

AGREED:

That the application be approved for the reasons set out at section 9.0 of the report, with amendments being made to the following conditions:

- Condition 3 - restricting the occupation to those who meet the definition of gypsies, and travellers set out in national policy.
- Condition 7 – amended to require the submission and approval of a landscaping scheme and a scheme of boundary treatments to be agreed prior to occupation.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 April 2026

- Condition 2 – wording to be added to tie the planning permission to a named person.

(Moved by Councillor Bingham, Seconded by Councillor Woolf)

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: Mrs D Ellis (Resident)

68. **H02-0759-25**

Planning No. and Applicant

H02-0759-25 Allison Homes Ltd

Proposal

Full application for development for 80 dwellings with access, landscape, drainage, open space and associated infrastructure at Land East of Normanton Road, Crowland.

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:

- Members queried whether internal roads would be adopted by the Highway Authority, noting that refuse collection vehicles cannot access private roads.
 - Officers advised that the majority of roads would be constructed to adoptable standards, and it was anticipated that Lincolnshire County Council would adopt them, subject to meeting required specifications. It was acknowledged that a small number of private driveways would remain, with occupiers expected to present wheelie bins at the edge of the adoptable highway.
- Concerns were raised regarding the transition to wheelie bins, bin storage, carrying distances, and the suitability of the refuse strategy in light of the Council's newly adopted waste policy.
 - Officers confirmed that a refuse strategy had been submitted with the application, including bin storage arrangements and collection distances, and advised that this was acceptable from a planning perspective.
- Members expressed concern about foul water disposal, noting that an earlier objection from Anglian Water had been withdrawn.
 - Officers explained that Anglian Water had reassessed capacity within the wastewater network and confirmed sufficient headroom existed to accommodate the development. Foul water was proposed to connect to the existing system on Normanton Road.
 - Officers also advised that the relevant statutory consultees, including the Lead Local Flood Authority, Internal Drainage Board and

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 April 2026

Environment Agency, had raised no objection in principle. Further detailed drainage schemes would be secured by condition and would require formal approval prior to development commencing.

- Members expressed concern that the need to raise land levels indicated the site was unsuitable for development, particularly in the context of future climate change.
 - Officers advised that raising site levels was a standard mitigation approach in high flood risk areas across the district.
 - Officers further explained that level changes had been carefully designed, with the smallest increases at site boundaries, additional separation distances, landscaped buffers and wildlife corridors to mitigate visual and amenity impacts. It was advised that, while the development would be visible, officers did not consider the increase in height to result in unacceptable harm through overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impact.
- Members noted that the site was allocated in the adopted Local Plan and queried whether development exceedance elsewhere in Crowland affected its status.
 - Officers confirmed that allocation remained valid, and that the principle of residential development was established. Refusal on the basis that the site allocation had been exceeded elsewhere would be unlikely to be defensible at appeal.
- Members queried why a sequential test had not been carried out for this site.
 - It was confirmed that no sequential test was required as the site formed part of the Local Plan allocations.
- Members raised concerns regarding construction traffic, dust, noise and the suitability of routing works vehicles through existing residential streets.
 - Officers advised that a Construction Management Plan would be required by condition, detailing routes, dust suppression, traffic management and hours of operation. It was indicated that the preferred construction access route was via adjacent land to the north rather than through the estate.
- Suggestions were made regarding permanent alternative access through adjacent land
 - Officers advised this fell outside the application red line boundary and was not before the Committee.
- Some Members considered the scheme to be typical estate housing but acknowledged it reflected comparable developments elsewhere in the district.
 - Officers confirmed that separation distances, landscaping, wildlife corridors and boundary treatments had been designed to mitigate impacts on neighbouring dwellings.
- Requests were made for strong landscaping and long-term management of the wildlife corridor.
 - Officers proposed securing a management plan for the wildlife buffer through additional conditions.
- Members queried when Section 106 contributions would be paid.
 - Officers advised that trigger points would be set within the legal agreement, typically at a 50% occupation thresholds.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 April 2026

Councillor Brewis requested that his vote against the application to be recorded in the minutes.

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.

AGREED:

That the application be approved for the reasons set out at section 9.0 of the report, including the addition of a condition relating to a management plan for the wildlife corridor (should this not already be covered in existing conditions), and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement securing the necessary financial contributions and affordable housing provision set out within the report above.

(Moved by Councillor Bingham, Seconded by Councillor Tennant)

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: George Wilkinson (Allison Homes) (Applicant)

Objector: John Russell (Resident)

69. **H11-0056-26**

Planning No. and Applicant

H11-0056-26 Mossop & Bowser

Proposal

Full application for change of use from former gift & interiors shop to ground floor and hair & beauty salon on first floor to solicitors office to include alterations and insertion of rooflights at 4 High Street, Long Sutton, Spalding.

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:

- The description for the application was confusing and should be amended to clarify that both floors were being converted into a solicitors office.

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.

AGREED:

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 April 2026

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

(Moved by Councillor Tyrrell, Seconded by Councillor Bingham)

70. **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.

71. **PLANNING UPDATES.**

There were none.

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

There were none.

(The meeting ended at 9.30 pm)

(End of minutes)