

Guildhall Gainsborough
Lincolnshire DN21 2NA
Tel: 01427 676676 Fax: 01427 675170

AGENDA

This meeting will be webcast live and the video archive published on our website

Planning Committee
Wednesday, 12th November, 2025 at 6.30 pm
Council Chamber - The Guildhall

Members:

- Councillor Ian Fleetwood (Chairman)
- Councillor Jacob Flear (Vice-Chairman)
- Councillor John Barrett
- Councillor Matthew Boles
- Councillor Karen Carless
- Councillor David Dobbie
- Councillor Adam Duguid
- Councillor Sabastian Hague
- Councillor Peter Morris
- Councillor Tom Smith
- Councillor Jim Snee

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Public Participation Period

Up to 15 minutes are allowed for public participation.
Participants are restricted to 3 minutes each.

3. To Approve the Minutes of the Previous Meeting (PAGES 3 - 20)

- i) Meeting of the Planning Committee held on
Wednesday 15 October 2025, previously circulated.

4. Declarations of Interest

Members may make any declarations of interest at this point
but may also make them at any time during the course of the
meeting.

5. **Update on Government/Local Changes in Planning Policy**

Note – the status of Neighbourhood Plans in the District may be found via this link

<https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building/neighbourhood-planning/>

6. **Planning Applications for Determination**

- i) WL/2025/00865 - 17 Gainsborough Sports & Social (PAGES 21 - 32)
Club Trinity Street, Gainsborough

7. **Determination of Appeals**

(PAGES 33 - 43)

Paul Burkinshaw
Head of Paid Service
The Guildhall
Gainsborough

Tuesday, 4 November 2025

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall on 15 October 2025 commencing at 6.30 pm.

Present: Councillor Ian Fleetwood (Chairman)
Councillor John Barrett
Councillor Matthew Boles
Councillor Emma Bailey
Councillor David Dobbie
Councillor Peter Morris
Councillor Tom Smith
Councillor Jim Snee

In Attendance:
Paul Burkinshaw Chief Executive
Russell Clarkson Development Management Team Manager
Ian Elliott Development Management Team Leader
Vicky Maplethorpe Development Management Officer
Martha Rees Legal Advisor
Molly Spencer Democratic & Civic Officer

Apologies: Councillor Jacob Flear
Councillor Karen Carless
Councillor Sabastian Hague

Membership: Councillor Emma Bailey was appointed substitute for Councillor Karen Carless.

Also in Attendance: 12 members of the public

35 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

There was no public participation.

36 TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Having been proposed and seconded, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 20 August 2025, be confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

37 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Barrett declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to application WL/2024/00974

as he was ward member for this application. He confirmed that he had received no correspondence in relation to the item under consideration, was satisfied he was approaching the matter with an open mind and were therefore able to participate in the meeting and decision-making process as normal.

38 UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT/LOCAL CHANGES IN PLANNING POLICY

The Committee was informed that recent updates had been made to national planning guidance concerning flood risk. In December 2024, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) had been revised to clarify that the sequential test must consider all sources of flooding, including surface water flooding, rather than solely fluvial flood risk. The sequential test was intended to direct development towards land that was reasonably available and at a lower risk of flooding.

It was noted that this amendment had caused concern within the development industry, which had sought further clarification on the application of the sequential test. In response, Planning Practice Guidance on Flood Risk had been updated in September 2025.

Paragraph 27 had been revised to state that the sequential test could be avoided if a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrated clearly that the proposed layout, design, and mitigation measures would ensure the safety of residents from both current and future surface water flooding for the lifetime of the development, without increasing flood risk elsewhere. This applies only to land at risk of surface water flooding, and not land at risk of river/coastal flooding.

Additionally, a new Paragraph 27a had been introduced to explain that, for individual applications, the area of search used to identify and compare sites based on flood risk would be determined by local circumstances relating to the catchment area of the proposed development. It was highlighted that this area could extend beyond local planning authority boundaries in cases involving infrastructure proposals of regional or national importance. However, for non-major residential development, the area of search would typically not extend beyond the town or city of the proposed site, or beyond an individual village and its immediate neighbouring settlements.

Further details had been made available through the updated Planning Practice Guidance on Flood Risk, accessible via the following link: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#the-sequential-approach-to-the-location-of-development>.

39 WL/2024/00947 - ASH TREE FARM SUDBROOKE LANE, NETTLEHAM

The Committee was advised by the Officer that the application site comprised a large, modern agricultural building situated to the east of Nettleham. The site was surrounded by open countryside, with Ash Tree Farmhouse located to the west, alongside another large agricultural building.

The existing structure measured approximately 41 metres by 18.5 metres and had been constructed using a steel portal frame, with a corrugated sheet roof. A large sliding door was positioned on the south-east elevation, and a hardstanding yard area was located externally.

It was noted that prior approval had been granted on 20 October 2023 for the conversion of the existing agricultural building. This approval had permitted a change of use from agricultural to residential, comprising four smaller dwellings and one larger dwelling.

The current application sought full planning permission for the demolition of the agricultural building and the erection of five dwellings in its place.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for her presentation and stated there were two registered speakers for this application; the first, Councillor Angela White, as a representative for Nettleham Parish Council was invited to address the Committee.

The Committee received a statement from Councillor Angela White, Chair of Nettleham Parish Council, who addressed Members in objection to the application.

It was acknowledged that the Officer's report had accepted the application as a departure from the development plan, specifically in relation to Policies S1 and S5 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (April 2023), and Policy D6(3) of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan (November 2024). These policies had formed the principal grounds for objection by the Parish Council.

Reference was made to the prior approval granted under Part 3 Class Q for application 147245, which had permitted the change of use of the existing agricultural building to five dwellings. It was stated that the current proposal relied on the fallback position, supported by case law and local precedent.

Councillor White recalled attending a workshop in 2015 on Neighbourhood Plans and the Localism Act, during which the powers of local communities to influence development location and housing numbers had been discussed. It was remarked that such powers had since diminished.

Concern was expressed regarding the preparation of the November 2024 Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan, in which sites and housing numbers had been determined without consultation with residents, in contrast to the 2016 version which had involved public engagement.

Further reference was made to a government policy change in 2019, which had allowed affordable housing to be built on unallocated sites. This had resulted in the development of 35 properties on Baker Drive, which had not been anticipated by existing residents.

It was noted that no comments had been received from neighbouring properties, as the site was located outside the developed footprint of the village. The only adjacent properties were an upholstery business in a nearby barn and Ash Tree Farm, which had been constructed under agricultural 'permitted development' provisions.

Concerns were raised regarding highway safety. The site was accessed via a narrow single-track road from Sudbrooke, subject to a 60mph speed limit. The Parish Council had highlighted issues relating to traffic speed and volume, particularly from vehicles avoiding congestion on the A158. The road passed the entrance to Larch Avenue, which now served as the exit point for two new estates comprising over 100 properties, before reaching the

junction with Lodge Lane where further traffic joined from the A158.

Although no objection had been raised by Lincolnshire County Council Highways, it was stated that traffic issues existed in the area and had the potential to worsen.

It was further noted that the provisions of Part 3 Class Q had been extended to allow up to ten properties since May 2025. It was suggested that the proposed development could act as a gateway to further development on the eastern side of the village.

In conclusion, Councillor White stated that local plans offered limited protection against further development. The Chairman thanked Councillor White for her comments, and invited the second speaker, Mr Michael Orridge, as Agent to take his seat.

The Committee received a statement from Mr Orridge, who spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of the application. Mr Orridge introduced himself as both the agent and architect for the proposal and provided an overview of the background, the improvements made, and the reasons why the current application represented a clear planning betterment compared to the existing Class Q permission.

It was explained that the site at Ash Tree Farm currently contained a large, modern agricultural shed. This building already benefited from prior approval under Class Q legislation for conversion into five dwellings, and that approval could be implemented at any time. However, Mr Orridge stated that such a conversion would result in residential units that were constrained in layout, visually harsh in appearance, and inefficient in terms of energy performance.

The current proposal sought to demolish the existing agricultural building and replace it with five purpose-built, low-energy homes. Mr Orridge emphasised that the new scheme would deliver improved design, enhanced sustainability, and a more appropriate relationship with the rural surroundings. These improvements were considered to align with the core aims of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

The proposed layout was reported as being carefully developed to reflect the traditional pattern of farmyard clusters, as illustrated in the submitted plans. The five dwellings would be arranged around a shared courtyard, which would help to reduce the scale and form of the development in comparison to the existing barn.

The proposed materials included timber and concrete cladding, along with standing-seam metal roofing. These materials had been selected to reflect the character of local agricultural buildings while achieving a high architectural standard with refined detailing. It was noted that the timber would weather naturally to a grey tone, allowing the dwellings to integrate sensitively into the surrounding landscape. Mr Orridge described the scheme as a clear visual improvement in every respect.

The proposal was also presented as a significant environmental enhancement over the fallback position. Each dwelling would be highly energy efficient and would comply with Policy S7, which required dwellings to generate as much renewable energy as they consumed. The scheme included solar panels, air-source heat pumps, and a highly insulated building fabric. A whole-life carbon assessment had confirmed that the proposed development would perform better over a sixty-year period than the conversion of the

existing concrete-framed structure.

Mr Orridge confirmed that all technical matters had been fully addressed. The site access had been upgraded in accordance with Lincolnshire County Council standards, and no objections had been raised by Lincolnshire County Council Highways. A ten percent biodiversity net gain would be delivered through on-site planting and habitat creation. The site was located within Flood Zone 1, and sustainable drainage systems had been incorporated to ensure that there would be no increased flood risk.

It was further noted that a fallback position existed for up to ten dwellings under the extended Class Q legislation and relevant case law, including the Mansell judgment. Mr Orridge also reported that he had spoken with the neighbour to the east of the site, who had contacted the office and, following discussion, had raised no objection to the proposal.

In conclusion, Mr Orridge stated that the proposal would replace a utilitarian agricultural shed with a well-designed, energy-efficient development that would sit comfortably within its rural setting. The scheme was described as offering clear planning betterment in terms of design quality, visual appearance, environmental performance, and residential amenity. It was confirmed that the proposal complied with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan, and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Mr Orridge respectfully requested that Members support the Officer's recommendation and grant planning permission for what was described as a sustainable and high-quality redevelopment of a farmyard site.

The Chairman thanked Mr Orridge for his comments and having asked the Officer if she had a response, which there was not, the Chairman opened the floor for discussion.

The Chairman commented that the site plans did not clearly show the location of the application site. Thanks were extended to the planning officer for including additional images within the presentation to assist Members.

A Committee Member stated that the application had been presented in a clear and concise manner and had not been difficult to understand. Reference was made to Policies S6 and S7, and it was noted that their application had been appropriately considered. They expressed the view that demolishing and rebuilding a structure would result in increased carbon emissions and therefore did not consider this to be a material planning consideration. It was acknowledged that the visual appearance of buildings was a matter of personal opinion, but it was accepted that the proposed dwellings would be more energy efficient over their lifetime.

Another Member of the Committee agreed with Councillor White's observation that the site was located outside the area identified within the Neighbourhood Plan. Concern was raised that the development of five dwellings could result in approximately ten vehicles. It was noted that the population of Nettleham had increased to approximately 5,000 over the past two years. Although the existing building was considered unsightly, a preference was expressed for the landowner to consider development outside the village boundary.

It was queried by a Member of the Committee whether, in the event that the development was not maintained, a condition could be imposed requiring the developer to ensure proper

upkeep. Concern was raised regarding the accuracy of highway assessments, particularly in light of local knowledge. It was suggested that West Lindsey District Council should be informed whether site visits had been undertaken by Highways Officers, and that further clarification could assist future decision-making.

In response, the Development Management Team Manager confirmed that the proposed road layout indicated a private road. It was acknowledged that the existing building could potentially be changed to up to ten dwellings, under permitted development allowances. It was not known whether Highways Officers had visited the site, but it was suggested that clarification could be sought and reported back to a future meeting.

Two further points were raised by a Member of the Committee. Firstly, concern was expressed regarding the long-term maintenance of the area, particularly if it was not adopted by Highways. It was queried how the site would be maintained following any future sale, including the treatment and upkeep of landscaping. Secondly, it was noted that while the views of Highways were considered, the Parish Council also held statutory status. It was questioned whether the concerns raised by the Parish Council should carry greater weight in the decision-making process.

The Chairman asked whether a management company or organisation would be responsible for the long-term maintenance of public access areas.

In response, the Development Management Team Manager stated that planning decisions were made in the wider public interest. It was confirmed that, should the Committee consider there to be a public issue, further consideration could be given to the matter.

A Member of the Committee expressed support for the proposal, noting that the development appeared to be located within the footprint of the existing building. The change from brownfield to residential use was welcomed. It was considered that the precedent set by such developments could be beneficial in assessing future applications and changes.

The Chairman concluded that there was no conflict with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. It was noted that the area had been identified by central government as requiring additional development land. It was stated that the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan must respond to this directive by providing further opportunities for residential development.

The proposal to accept the Officers recommendations was duly seconded and voted upon. It was therefore agreed that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

Recommended Conditions

Conditions stating the time by which the development must be commenced:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To conform with Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Conditions which apply or require matters to be agreed before the development

commenced:

No development hereby permitted must take place until a written Habitat Management and Maintenance Plan [HMMP], in accordance with the most recently submitted Statutory Biodiversity Metric dated 14th July 2025 and prepared by Kiran Johal Mzool, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The HMMP shall relate to all 'significant' biodiversity gains on site and must be strictly adhered to and implemented in full for a minimum of 30 years following the initial completion period approved pursuant to condition 11. The HMMP document must be produced in accordance with sections listed below:

- a) a non-technical summary;
- b) the roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering/monitoring the [HMMP];
- c) the details of funding, resources and mechanisms for long term delivery of the [HMMP].
- 4) the planned habitat creation and enhancement works for the initial 5 completion period to create or improve habitat.
- e) the management measures to maintain habitat for a period of 30 years from the end of initial habitat creation.
- f) the monitoring/reporting methodology and frequency in respect of the retained, created and/or enhanced habitat to be submitted to the local planning authority on years 1, 5, 10, 15, 20 and 30. All reports must be submitted no later than September 1st on each reporting year (reports may be produced by those meeting the definition of a competent person as defined by the statutory Small Site Metric user guide)
- g) the mechanisms of adaptive management and remedial measures to account for changes in the work schedule to achieve required targets.

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Policy S61 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023-2043.

No development shall take place until a written Ecological Mitigation & Enhancement Plan (EMEP) prepared in accordance with the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Reptile Surveys dated October 2024 and prepared by Archer Ecology is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The EMEP shall include: -

- Details of any precautionary method statements for protected species
- Details of a sensitive lighting strategy
- Details of wildlife friendly landscaping within curtilage of private dwellings (including native tree planting, garden ponds, flowering lawns and urban greening [i.e. rain gardens])
- Details of educational leaflets to be provided to all residence as to the enhancements for wildlife within their own cartilage and the wider development.
- Details, specification location of hedgehog highway within all closed panel fence boundaries and 1x hedgehog refugia
- Details, specification, locations of amphibian friendly curb and drain treatments.
- Details, specification and location of the following species enhancements incorporated into structures across the site:
 - Integrated bird boxes, Total across site to be equal to number of dwellings (swift bricks should be installed in groups of 3)
 - 1x Pole mounted Owl boxes

- Integrated bat boxes, Total across site to be equal to number of dwellings
- 2 bee/insect bricks per dwelling

The EMEP shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved plan. All features shall be installed during construction and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of nature conservation and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy S60 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

Conditions which apply or are to be observed during the course of the development:

With the exception of the detailed matters referred to by the conditions of this consent, the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:

- J20001-PL-00 P01 dated 23/7/25
- J20001-PL-01 P02 dated 23/07/25
- J2000a-PL-02 P04 dated 19/9/25
- J2000a-PL-03 P01 dated 23/7/25
- J2000a-PL-10 P01 dated 01/11/24
- J2000a-PL-11 P01 dated 01/11/24
- J2000a-PL-12 P02 Dated 19/9/25
- J2000a-PL-13 P01 dated 01/11/24
- J20001-PL-20 P02 dated 19/9/25
- J2000a-PL-21 P02 dated 19/9/25

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans and in any other approved documents forming part of the application.

Reason: To ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the approved plans and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

No development above foundations level shall take place until a scheme of foul sewage and surface water drainage has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent flooding and protect future residents to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy S21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details set out in the Amended Energy Statement A02 dated 18th October 2025 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with the provisions of Policies S6 and S7 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2023).

Prior to occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted, a written verification statement shall be submitted to demonstrate that the approved scheme has been implemented in full, in accordance with the Amended Energy Statement A02 dated 18th October 2025 and

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with the provisions of Policies S6 and S7 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

No external lighting shall be installed on the development hereby permitted unless a scheme of external lighting is submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development hereby permitted does not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity to accordance the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

If during the course of development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present on the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until a method statement detailing how and when the contamination is to be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The contamination shall then be dealt with in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard human health in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy S56 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

10. The Biodiversity Gain Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the most recently updated Statutory Biodiversity Metric dated 14th July 2025 and prepared by Kiran Johal Mzool.

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Policy S61 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023-2043.

11. Notice in writing shall be given to the Council within 15 working days of the Initial habitat creation and enhancement works as set out in the HMMP being completed.

Reason: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Policy S61 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023-2043.

12. Prior to occupation of the approved dwellings evidence must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority that a rainwater harvesting butt of a minimum 100 litres has been installed.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable water management in accordance with policy S12 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

Conditions which apply or relate to matters which are to be observed following completion of the development:

13. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order), no development as may otherwise be permitted by virtue of the following: Ø Schedule 2 Part 1 Classes A, AA, B, C, D, E, F, G and H of the Order shall be carried out within the curtilage of the dwelling permitted; and Ø Schedule 2 Part 2 Class A, without express permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development hereby permitted does not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area in accordance with paragraph 130 f) of the National Planning and Policy Framework and Policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

40 WL/2025/00837 - LAND ADJACENT 2 SCHOOL LANE, GRAYINGHAM

The Chairman introduced the second application of the meeting and invited the Officer to present.

The Committee was advised that the application site related to a vacant parcel of land located within Grayingham. The site had previously been used as a vehicle breakers yard. It was noted that the site was adjoined to the east by two recently constructed dwellings, with other residential properties situated along all remaining boundaries. The northern boundary of the site was defined by hedging, and a Public Right of Way, referenced Gray/10/1, ran adjacent to this boundary along School Lane.

The application sought full planning permission for the erection of a single storey, three-bedroom dwelling and a detached double garage. The proposed dwelling would measure approximately 26.2 metres in maximum width, 12.7 metres in maximum depth, 2.6 metres to the eaves, and 4.2 metres in total height. The proposed detached double garage would measure approximately 6.2 metres in width and 6.2 metres in depth, with an eaves height of 2.5 metres and a total height of 4.1 metres.

The Committee was informed that a late comment had been received from the Archaeology Department at Lincolnshire County Council. It had been confirmed that there was unlikely to be any archaeological impact arising from the proposed development. It was noted that a minor amendment was required to Condition 9 of the draft decision notice, where the word “dwellings” should be corrected to “dwelling”. Furthermore, it was advised that the wording of Condition 12 should be amended to include the phrase “without express planning permission from the local planning authority” at the end of the condition.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his presentation and stated there were two registered speakers for this application; the first, Kate Kelly, on behalf of the applicant was invited to address the Committee.

The Committee received a statement from the applicant’s representative in support of the proposal. It was stated that the application, similar in nature to the previously considered proposal in Grayingham, had been fully assessed and found to comply with Policy S1 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

It was noted that the plot size was consistent with neighbouring residential plots and similar in character to two recently approved dwellings located adjacent to the site. The proposed

separation distances were considered appropriate, and the design included a single-storey bungalow with the main private garden area situated to the rear, on the southern side of the property.

The site benefitted from an existing access, and it had been confirmed by both the Local Planning Authority and Lincolnshire County Council Highways that the proposal would not result in any detrimental impact on highway safety. The application was also confirmed to be compliant with Policy S21.

In relation to drainage, it was stated that foul water services had been considered, and there was no requirement for a single dwelling to address any wider capacity issues. The proposal included rainwater harvesting measures as part of its sustainability credentials.

It was acknowledged that some residents had submitted objections to the application, and these concerns had been noted. However, it was highlighted that both bungalows located to the east of the site had previously received support from Members of the Committee, and the current proposal was similar in detail and scale. In conclusion, the speaker stated that the proposed development would make an important contribution to local housing provision and was in accordance with relevant planning policies.

The Chairman thanked Ms Kelly for her statement and invited the second speaker, Mr David Harrison, as objector, to address the Committee.

The Committee received a statement from Mr David Harrison, who that he resided in one of the two cottages adjacent to the application site and that his written objection had been submitted and included within the published documents.

Mr Harrison raised two principal concerns. The first related to the existing hedgerow. He expressed a hope that additional measures could be considered to protect the hedgerow beyond the provisions of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. It was stated that, should the hedgerow be removed following the sale of the property, the resulting loss of screening would lead to overlooking and a reduction in privacy at his property. Mr Harrison queried whether, if the Committee felt unable to determine the application at the current meeting, a deferral could be considered to allow further review.

The second concern related to construction traffic and site access. Mr Harrison explained that School Lane was an unadopted road and not designed to accommodate heavy vehicles. He reported that over 120 heavy goods vehicles had been recorded using the road over the past year. Particular concern was raised regarding the structural vulnerability of his property, which included a traditionally built central section that was susceptible to vibration. Mr Harrison requested that consideration be given to how hardstanding materials would be broken up and removed from the site in a manner that was sensitive to the surrounding properties.

Mr Harrison clarified that he was not objecting to the principle of development but was instead seeking reasonable adjustments. He noted that construction traffic had previously caused delays for his daughter travelling to school and suggested that a traffic management plan be considered. It was acknowledged that such plans were mandatory for larger developments and requested that similar provisions be explored for smaller schemes such as the one under consideration.

The Chairman thanked Mr Harrison for his statement and asked if there was a response from the Officer. The Committee was advised that the existing hedgerow along the northern boundary of the site was subject to a landscaping condition, specifically Condition 7 of the draft decision notice. The Officer confirmed that the retention of the hedgerow would be supported and required and the removal of a section measuring approximately five metres, could have a detrimental impact on the amenity, privacy of neighbouring properties and Biodiversity Net Gain. It was stated that the planning team was in agreement that the hedgerow should be retained.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his response and invited Members to comment.

A Member of the Committee commented that the application was located on a brownfield site and supported the principle of development. Another raised concerns regarding the interpretation of Policy S1 in relation to development within hamlets. It was stated that, based on training and previous meetings, the policy had typically been applied to allow up to three dwellings within a hamlet. Reference was made to a 2018 appeal decision, which had emphasised the importance of maintaining clear gaps between properties. A Committee Member expressed the view that the current proposal did not reflect the intended application of the policy.

In response, the Officer confirmed that matters relating to the hedgerow would be addressed through the discharge of Condition 7. With regard to construction traffic, it was confirmed that the timing of works could be controlled, and that a Construction Management Plan would be required.

The Chairman supported the Officer's approach to managing the hedgerow through condition discharge procedures. It was agreed that an additional condition (Condition 13) would be imposed, requiring the submission of a Construction Management Plan. The plan would include restrictions on construction activity during school travel times.

It was queried by a Member of the Committee whether consultation with local schools would be necessary to determine appropriate timings. In response, the Officer confirmed that operational hours would be set out within the Construction Management Plan.

The Legal Advisor sought clarification regarding the extent of Officer discretion in relation to delivery timings. The Officer advised that it would be preferable to specify permitted delivery times within the condition to ensure clarity and enforceability.

It was agreed that the hedgerow would be retained, and that Condition 7 be amended to specify this.

It was further confirmed that Condition 9 required a spelling correction, replacing "dwellings" with "dwelling", and that Condition 12 should be amended to include the phrase "without express planning permission from the local planning authority".

Condition 13 would be added to require a Construction Management Plan, with permitted construction hours to be restricted to avoid conflict with school traffic.

The Development Management Team Manager stated that, where construction activities conflicted with existing conditions, a Construction Management Plan would be required to address the issue. The reason for the condition would be clearly stated as the need to avoid

disruption during school travel times.

Concern was expressed by a Member of the Committee regarding School Lane; they suggested that no vehicles should be parked on the site prior to the permitted construction hours. In response, the Officer advised that such a restriction would fall outside the remit of the Planning Committee. However, it was confirmed that provision for on-site construction parking could be included within the Construction Management Plan.

A proposal for a site visit was moved and duly seconded. Subsequently, a second proposal seeking to grant planning permission was tabled. The proposal for a site visit was considered first. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was lost with three Members voting in favour and four voting against.

The proposal to accept the Officers recommendations was duly seconded and voted upon. It was therefore agreed that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

Conditions stating the time by which the development must be commenced:

1.The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To conform with Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Conditions which apply or require matters to be agreed before the development commenced:

2. No development, including any site clearance shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The Management Plan shall indicate measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of vehicle activity during the construction stage of the permitted development. It shall include;

- The on-site loading and unloading of all plant and materials;
- The on-site storage of all plant and materials used in constructing the development storage of materials to be away from the boundary hedge;
- A plan to show the on-site parking of all vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- Details of the sites operational/working hours;
- Details of the times for all site deliveries.

The development shall only proceed in accordance with the approved construction management plan.

Conditions which apply or are to be observed during the course of the development:

3.With the exception of the detailed matters referred to by the conditions of this consent, the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:

Site Location Plan 720.07A
Scheme Block Plan 720.06 B

Floor Plans, Elevations and Sections 720.05C

The work, including proposed materials shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the approved plans.

4. The Biodiversity Gain Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the Ecological and Biodiversity Net Gain Statement dated July 2025 and prepared by ESL Ecological Services.

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

5. No development shall take place above foundation level until a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters (including the results of soakaway/percolation tests) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall detail how the drainage hierarchy has been followed in relation to surface water. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure adequate drainage facilities are provided to serve the development and to prevent pollution of the water environment in accordance with Policy S21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

6. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accordance with the details set out in the submitted Energy Statement by G Reports dated June 2025 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with the provisions of policies S6 and S7 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2023).

7. Prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby approved a written verification statement shall be submitted to demonstrate that the approved scheme has been implemented in full, in accordance with the submitted Energy Statement by G Reports received June 2025 and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with the provisions of policies S6 and S7 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2023).

8. Prior to the first occupation of the development, a scheme of landscaping including details of the size, species and position or density of all trees and hedges to be planted, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall also include details of all new hard landscaping, including proposed boundary treatments. All planting comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall at the latest be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the relevant dwelling; and any landscaping which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development dies, is removed, or becomes seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity enhancements and visual amenity in accordance with Policy S53 and Policy S60 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

9. The development hereby permitted shall proceed in strict accordance with the recommendations contained within Section 6 of the Ecological Appraisal by ESL dated July 2025.

Reason: In the interests of protected species in accordance with Policies S60 and S61 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and the provisions of the NPPF.

10. Prior to occupation of the approved dwelling evidence must be submitted to the local planning authority that a rainwater harvesting butt of a minimum 100 litres has been installed.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable water management in accordance with policy S12 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

11. If during the course of development, any contamination is found to be present on site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a method statement detailing how and when the contamination is to be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The contamination shall then be dealt with in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard human health and the water environment and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy S56 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

12. All new hardstanding shall be constructed from a porous material or shall be appropriately drained within the site and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure appropriate drainage to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy S21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

Conditions which apply or relate to matters which are to be observed following completion of the development:

13. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and reenacting that Order with or without modification) no domestic oil tanks or domestic gas tanks shall be placed within the curtilage of the dwelling hereby approved without express planning permission from the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of energy efficiency to accord with policies S6 and S7 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2023.

41 WL/2025/00460 & WL/2025/00462 - TEN ACRES CAFE, TOP ROAD, OSGODBY

The Chairman introduced the final application of the evening and invited the Officer to

present.

The Committee was advised that two planning applications had been presented concerning the Ten Acres Café site, situated in open countryside within the wider parish of Osgodby and designated as an Area of Great Landscape Value.

It was explained that both applications had sought the removal of occupancy conditions attached to previous planning permissions. The first application related to Condition 2 of permission 96/P/0805, which had restricted the occupancy of an annex to individuals employed or last employed in the operation of Ten Acres Café and the associated haulage company. The second application concerned Condition 3 of permission W75/872/91, which had limited the occupancy of the main dwelling to individuals employed in the operation of Ten Acres Café and the operation of three heavy goods vehicles.

The Committee had been informed that both dwellings had originally been permitted solely on the basis of their functional connection to the café and haulage operations. It was noted that the removal of these conditions would result in unrestricted residential use, which would be contrary to both local and national planning policy that seeks to prevent unjustified residential development in the countryside.

The Officer raised concerns regarding the potential impact on residential amenity and the character of the designated landscape area. The Officer had recommended that both applications be refused.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for their comments and invited the only registered speaker on this application, Mr Cook, as agent to address the Committee.

Mr Cook addressed the Committee in objection to the officer's recommendation for refusal of applications WL/2025/00460 and WL/2025/00462. He spoke on behalf of the applicant.

He stated that the applicant was disappointed with the recommendation for refusal, particularly in light of the absence of objections to the proposals. Reference was made to planning law, which required decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It was asserted that such material considerations had not been fully taken into account.

Mr Cook disputed the officer's view that the proposals would result in unacceptable development in open countryside, stating that no new development was proposed and that both the dwelling and café were existing and established. He emphasised that no physical alterations were intended.

The Committee was informed that the café required investment to secure its long-term future and viability. It was explained that the current arrangements, whereby both properties were considered commercial by lenders, resulted in borrowing costs that rendered investment unviable. Separation of the properties was therefore sought to enable funding to be released.

The speaker further stated that the applicant intended to lease the café to a suitable individual or organisation to ensure its continued operation, while retaining ownership. The café was described as a valued community asset, serving as a social hub and providing

meals to local residents, including the elderly.

Mr Cook argued that the existing occupancy conditions restricted flexibility and limited opportunities for improvement. Financial information had been submitted to the case officer in support of this position. It was suggested that the conditions had served their purpose and that there were no challenging reasons preventing approval. The Committee was asked to support the applications.

Attention was drawn to the claim that the applicant could reside in the dwelling regardless of the café's operation, and that the condition could be circumvented by nominal employment arrangements. It was argued that greater harm would result from refusal of the applications, placing the café's future at risk.

Mr Cook concluded by stating that the applicant would be agreeable to suitably worded conditions or a legal agreement and urged Members to support the proposals.

The Chairman thanked Mr Cook for his comments and with no further registered speakers, and no response from Officers, he opened the debate and noted that no representations had been received from the Ward Member, Parish Council, or local residents.

A Member of the Committee expressed concern regarding the rationale for refusal, stating that the Committee should be supporting local businesses. It was suggested that failure to approve the applications would likely result in the closure of the café and the creation of a vacant property.

Two points were raised by another Member of the Committee. Firstly, a question was directed to Officers regarding the enforceability of the occupancy condition, referencing the agent's suggestion that it could be circumvented through a zero-hours contract. It was stated that if the condition could be subverted in this way, it would not be enforceable. Secondly, concern was expressed regarding the financial implications, noting that failure to resolve the matter could result in another derelict property in the countryside, which was considered particularly problematic given the site's location within the Lincolnshire Gateway Business Park. Reference was also made to HGV parking, with the view that any future buyer would be aware of the site's operational context.

The Development Management Team Manager responded that the conditions were as displayed and did not believe they could be subverted in the manner suggested. Comparisons were drawn with standard wording used for agricultural worker conditions. It was noted that the dwelling had been granted approximately 30 years ago, and concern was expressed regarding the potential for substandard arrangements. Reference was made to the distinction between residential and commercial properties when linked or separated. It was advised that the applicant should undertake further work and consider submitting a legal agreement to demonstrate how ownership of the café would be retained.

A Member of the Committee queried the implications of zero-hours contracts in relation to the occupancy condition, asking whether such an arrangement would satisfy the condition if someone were to move into the dwelling under those terms.

The Legal Advisor agreed with the Development Management Team Manager, stating that the condition had been written prior to the existence of zero-hours contracts and that a

negative view would likely be taken of any attempt to circumvent it. However, it was noted that this was a matter of opinion and not fact, and that further research into employment law would be required.

A Member of the Committee expressed concern that if the café operator resided elsewhere and the dwelling remained vacant, it would be detrimental. It was suggested that the best way forward would be for the applicant to return with a legal agreement.

A proposal for a site visit was moved and duly seconded. Subsequently, a second proposal seeking deferral of the item was tabled. The proposal for a site visit was considered first. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was lost with three Members voting in favour and four voting against.

During the debate, reference was made to the Planning Committee Code of Practice in relation to site visits. A Member of the Committee stated that they were familiar with the location and did not consider a site visit to be necessary. However, Section 'K' of the Code of Practice was quoted, prompting further discussion.

NOTE: Councillor Dobbie exited the meeting at 8.06pm and entered at 8.07pm.

It was requested that the Code of Practice be reviewed as a matter of urgency to ensure clarity and consistency, particularly in circumstances where Members may feel sufficiently informed without the need for a formal site visit.

The proposal for deferral was then considered. Having been seconded and voted upon, it was

RESOLVED that the application be deferred to allow further negotiation with applicant to secure a legal agreement and/or alternatively worded condition to enable cafe owner to occupy the dwelling

42 DETERMINATION OF APPEALS

With no comments, questions or requirements for a vote the appeal decisions were **DULY NOTED**.

43 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT: FORMAL CASE UPDATE

With no comments, questions or requirement for a vote, the Planning Enforcement Report was **NOTED**.

The meeting concluded at 8.13 pm.

Chairman



Officers Report
Planning Application No: WL/2025/00865

PROPOSAL: Planning application for change of use from a Social Club (sui generis) to a Place of Worship (F1(f)).

LOCATION: 17 GAINSBOROUGH SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB TRINITY STREET GAINSBOROUGH DN21 2AL
WARD: Gainsborough South West
APPLICANT NAME: Mr Alistair Wearing (Hope Church Gainsborough)

TARGET DECISION DATE: 14/11/2025
DEVELOPMENT TYPE: Change of Use
CASE OFFICER: Richard Green

RECOMMENDED DECISION: Grant with conditions attached.

The application is referred to the planning committee for determination in line with the constitution as the applicant is an employee of West Lindsey District Council.

Description:

The application site is a social club (Gainsborough Sports and Social Club) located within the developed footprint of Gainsborough on the eastern side of Trinity Street close to the northern end of the street. There are commercial uses on the ground floors of buildings to the north, west and to the south of the site with some residential accommodation on the first floors. There are residential dwellings to the rear (east) of the site. There is a Grade II Listed Building (No. 70 Beaumont Street and No.1-3 Southolme) located approximately 52 metres to the north.

The application seeks permission to change the use of the building from a members only Social Club (sui generis use) to a Place of Worship (F1(f) use). The social club is approximately 464.5 sqm floor space on 2 stories with a flat situated on the 1st floor and extending into the attic. On the ground floor there are two toilets, a bar lounge, a games room, a function room and a pump room as well as several storerooms, on the 1st floor is a large snooker room, more storerooms and a kitchen and bathroom for the self contained flat, in the attic is a bedroom for the flat and a storeroom.

The place of worship (Hope Church Gainsborough) currently operates from 'The Pattern Store, Station Approach, Gainsborough'. The proposed church on Trinity Street will provide a place of worship (Sunday Services etc) as well as space for youth work, parent and toddler groups, coffee mornings and to continue to run the "Hope Kitchen" providing weekly lunches to the community. Internal alterations only are proposed to create a lounge, creche room, lounge, sanctuary with stage, kitchen, toilets and store rooms on the ground floor, a Sunday school, youth room, toilets and store rooms on the first floor and store rooms on the second floor. No operating hours are proposed.

Relevant history:

PRE/2025/00132 - Pre-application enquiry for change of use from a Social Club (sui generis) to a Place of Worship (F1(f)). Following advice given 18/07/2025 *'It is my opinion that with the appropriate evidence that the Social Club is no longer fit for purpose or the service provided by the social club is provided elsewhere within Gainsborough then the loss of the social club could be supported in principle.'*

Furthermore, in terms of the new church/place of worship in this location it is considered that the principle of development can be supported for this community facility as per Policy S50 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.'

W33/984/91 - Planning permission to change the use and alterations to shop to form extension to club in accordance with amended plan received 30 January 1992. Granted 04/02/92.

GU/127/69 - MAKE ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING CLUB AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REVISED PARTICULARS RECEIVED ON 18TH AUGUST, 1969.

GU/92/65 - ALTER CLUB AND SHOP PREMISES

Hope Church, The Pattern Store, Station Approach, Gainsborough

131385 - Planning application for change of use from B1-offices to D1-public place of worship. Granted 31/07/2014.

Representations:

Chairman/Ward member(s): No representations received to date.

Gainsborough Town Council: Support the application.

Local Residents and Occupiers: No representations received to date.

LCC Highways and Lead Local Flood Authority: The site is located in a central urban area which can be accessed via sustainable travel options such as walking, cycling and public transport. Future users of the site will not be reliant on the private car but if they do decide to drive, there are public car parks in close proximity to the site, therefore it will not have an unacceptable impact on the public highway.

Having given due regard to the appropriate local and national planning policy guidance (in particular the National Planning Policy Framework), Lincolnshire County Council (as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority) has concluded that the proposed development would not be expected to have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety or a severe residual cumulative impact upon the local highway network or increase surface water flood risk and therefore does not wish to object to this planning application.

Archaeology: 17/10/2025 - Given the information provided (internal photographs showing that no historical features remain) I retract my initial recommendations.

29/08/2025 - According to Kelly's Directory of Lincolnshire (1905) "the Liberal Club, registered under the Friendly Societies Act in 1875, was transferred in Dec. 1889 to premises in Trinity street, containing billiard, smoke, game and reading rooms, and a library of over 2,000 volumes." This building has been used since 1889 as a member's club and would have formed part of the social and political history of Gainsborough.

There are internal alterations proposed which will affect the existing fixtures and fittings associated with the historic use as a club. Internal modifications may also impact the historic fabric of the building. The change in use will also mean an exterior loss in the legibility of the historic use of the building as a club.

I recommend that, if permission is granted, the standard archaeological scheme of works conditions set out in the Lincolnshire Archaeological Handbook are placed. This condition wording, would allow for the preparation of an historic building recording that would aim to preserve by record the building as it currently stands, as well as any changes there have been to its fabric since its erection.

It would be beneficial to have a public record of the history of the building, and its evolution, prior to its change of use and its internal modification, given the role the institution would have had in the town's social and political history. I also recommend that there be a condition for the inclusion of an inscription or plaque in the exterior of the building, to be agreed with this department, which would indicate the buildings historic use. This will help towards creating a sense of place and contribute to local character and distinctiveness.

Conservation Officer: No representations received to date.

Relevant Planning Policies:

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Here, the Development Plan comprises the provisions of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (adopted in April 2023) and the Gainsborough Town Neighbourhood Plan (adopted in June 2021).

Development Plan:

The following policies are particularly relevant:

Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP):

Policy S1: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy
Policy S2: Growth Levels and Distribution of Growth
Policy S13: Reducing Energy Consumption in Existing Buildings
Policy S21: Flood Risk and Water Resources
Policy S47: Accessibility and Transport
Policy S49: Parking Provision
Policy S50: Community Facilities
Policy S53: Design and Amenity
Policy S56: Development on Land Affected by Contamination

Policy S57: The Historic Environment

<https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/central-lincolnshire>

Gainsborough Town Neighbourhood Plan:

Policy NPP1: Sustainable Development

Policy NPP5: Protecting the Landscape Character

Policy NPP6: Ensuring High Quality Design

Policy NPP7: Ensuring High Quality Design in each Character Area

Policy NPP18: Protecting and Enhancing Heritage Assets

<https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/planning-building-control/planning/neighbourhood-planning/all-neighbourhood-plans-west-lindsey/gainsborough-town-neighbourhood-plan>

National policy & guidance (Material Consideration)

- **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It is a material consideration in planning decisions. The most recent iteration of the NPPF was published in December 2024.

National Planning Policy Framework

- **National Planning Practice Guidance**

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

- **National Design Guide (2019)**

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-design-guide>

- **National Design Code (2021)**

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-model-design-code>

LB Legal Duty

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/9/section/66>

Relevant Legislation

- Use Classes Order 1987 (As Amended)

The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987

- Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended.

[The Town and Country Planning \(General Permitted Development\) \(England\) Order 2015](#)

Main issues

- Principle of Development
- Residential Amenity (including noise)
- Visual Impact
- Highway Safety and Car Parking
- Listed Building
- Other Matters

Assessment:

Principle of Development:

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Firstly, the proposal is for a new community facility (a place of worship) to operate from 17 Trinity Street, Gainsborough. Policy S50 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan supports new community facilities subject to the following criteria:

- d) Prioritise and promote access by walking, cycling and public transport. Community facilities may have a local or wider catchment area: access should be considered proportionately relative to their purpose, scale and catchment area;*
- e) Be accessible for all members of society;*
- f) Be designed so that they are adaptable and can be easily altered to respond to future demands if necessary; and*
- g) Where applicable, be operated without detriment to local residents: this especially applies to facilities which are open in the evening, such as leisure and recreation facilities.*

The proposal will be located within the developed footprint of Gainsborough in a highly sustainable location close to the train stations serving Gainsborough and the bus station. The Hope Church operates an open door policy and the current building can be adapted through internal alterations only to meet the needs of the Church. Finally, the proposal will replace an existing social club on a commercial street and could therefore operate without detriment to local residents. Therefore, the proposal for a new church can be supported in principle as it accords with Policy S50 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

However, the Church already operates close by in Gainsborough and the proposal would lead to the loss of a Community Facility (a Social Club). Therefore, the following criteria/section of Policy S50 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan must be considered.

Policy S50 of the CLLP states that the loss of existing community facilities (or sites with such a permitted use) will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that:

- a. The facility is demonstrably no longer fit for purpose and the site is not viable to be redeveloped for a new community facility; or*
- b. The service provided by the facility is met by alternative provision that exists within reasonable proximity: what is deemed as reasonable proximity will depend on the nature of the facility and its associated catchment area; or*

- c. *The proposal includes the provision of a new community facility of similar nature and of a similar or greater size in a suitable on or offsite location.*

It is noted that the social club is a private members club and that the social club is not listed within Appendix B – Schedule of Buildings providing community services or facilities of the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan. It is also noted that the social club is not listed on the following list of Assets of Community Value:

[Community Right to Bid and Assets of Community Value | West Lindsey District Council](#)

Gainsborough has approximately 12 public houses and social clubs within the town, with the nearest Public House (The White Horse, Silver Street) located a 0.5 kilometre walk away and the nearest sports and social club (United Services Club, Bridge Steet) located a 0.6 kilometre walk away. It is therefore considered that the service provided by the social club is provided elsewhere within Gainsborough.

It is therefore considered that the principle of development is acceptable in accordance with the NPPF and policy S50 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

It is proposed to change the use of the building from a members only Social Club (sui generis use) to a Place of Worship (F1(f) use), with internal alterations only apart from signage.

Policy S53 of the CLLP requires that development proposals do not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity. This includes considerations such as compatibility with neighbouring land uses, noise, vibration, odour, and the creation of safe environments amongst other things.

As the proposal will convert and redevelop an existing building there are no issues of loss of light, over dominance or overlooking. The building subject of this application is located in a predominantly commercial area with no operating hours proposed as the Church wish to remain open 24/7 for prayer, support and emergency pastoral care. No operating hours were imposed on the existing place of worship on Station Approach, Gainsborough under planning permission 131385 and the planning permission relating to the current use of the site as a social club also have no operating hours imposed. There will be no external gathering, noise or sound proposed for outside the building and bearing in mind the location close to the defined Town Centre and surrounded by predominately commercial uses the proposal in regards to residential amenity is acceptable.

It is considered that the development would not have an unacceptable harmful impact on the living conditions of existing neighbouring uses and would accord with Policy S53 and the provisions of the NPPF.

Visual Impact

Local Plan Policy S53 states that all development *‘must achieve high quality sustainable design that contributes positively to local character, landscape and townscape, and supports diversity, equality and access for all.’* Development

must 'relate well to the site, its local and wider context and existing characteristics including the retention of existing natural and historic features wherever possible and including appropriate landscape and boundary treatments to ensure that the development can be satisfactorily assimilated into the surrounding area'.

It further states that development should 'contribute positively to the sense of place, reflecting and enhancing existing character and distinctiveness', and should 'be appropriate for its context and its future use in terms of its building types, street layout, development block type and size, siting, height, scale, massing, form, rhythm, plot widths, gaps between buildings, and the ratio of developed to undeveloped space both within a plot and within a scheme.' In addition, development must *'achieve a density not only appropriate for its context but also taking into account its accessibility.'*

It is proposed to change the use of the building from a members only Social Club (sui generis use) to a Place of Worship (F1(f) use), with internal alterations only. The building subject of this application is located in a predominantly commercial area.

It is therefore considered that the proposal will not harm the character and appearance of the street-scene in accordance with the NPPF and Policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

Highway Safety and Car Parking

Local Plan Policy S47 and S49 requires well designed, safe and convenient access for all, and that appropriate vehicle parking provision is made for development users. Policy S49 states that all development apart from residential should incorporate a level of car parking that is suitable for the proposed development taking into account its location, its size and its proposed use, including the expected number of employees, customers or visitors.

The application seeks permission to change the use of the building from a members only Social Club (sui generis use) to a Place of Worship (F1(f) use). The site is located close to the Town Centre of Gainsborough and can be accessed via the Central and Lea Road train stations, the bus station and cycling and walking. If future users do decide to drive as is the case with the current Social Club use of the site there is existing car parking on Trinity Street and surrounding car parks in the centre of Gainsborough which can be utilised.

Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states that in assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

- a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;
- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and
- c) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

The Highways Authority have no objections in relation to impacts upon highway safety. Overall, the proposed highway arrangements (car parking) are acceptable and the proposal is considered to accord with Policy S47 and S49 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and the NPPF.

Listed Building Setting

There is a Grade II Listed Building (No. 70 Beaumont Street and No.1-3 Southolme) located approximately 52 metres to the north.

S.66 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 places a legislative requirement that when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Paragraph 210 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities in determining applications, should take account of:

*'a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.'*

Policy S57 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan states that *'Development proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will, in principle, be supported where they make a positive contribution to, or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building.'*

The proposal is for a change of use of the building from a members only Social Club (sui generis use) to a Place of Worship (F1(f) use) with no external alterations.

It is therefore considered that the proposal will not harm the setting of nearby Listed Buildings in accordance with the NPPF, Policy S57 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and the statutory duty.

Other Matters:

Comments on energy efficiency and biodiversity net gain policies

The proposal being a change of use application is exempt from biodiversity net gain.

As a change of use proposal, Policy S13 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan will apply. The policy encourages the improvement of energy efficiency as stated below:

'For all development proposals which involve the change of use or redevelopment of a building, or an extension to an existing building, the applicant is encouraged to consider all opportunities to improve the energy efficiency of that building (including the original building, if it is being extended).'

Therefore, as part of any future formal planning application an informative will be added to the decision notice encouraging the applicant to use PAS 2035:2019 Specifications and Guidance (or any superseding guidance) for this proposal.

Foul and Surface Water

The proposal will utilise the existing system at the site.

Contaminated Land:

The site is located within a contaminated land buffer zone. The proposal being a change of use application which will only involve internal alterations and signage and will therefore have no implications for contamination.

Advertisement Consent

It is noted that any new sign would be subject to the advertisement regulations and have not been considered as part of this application. If it is minded to grant planning permission a note to this effect will be attached to the decision notice.

Conclusion and reasons for decision:

The decision has been considered against Policy S1: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, S2: Growth Levels and Distribution of Growth, S13: Reducing Energy Consumption in Existing Buildings, Policy S21: Flood Risk and Water Resources, S47: Accessibility and Transport, S49: Parking Provision, S50: Community Facilities, S53: Design and Amenity, S56: Development on Land Affected by Contamination and S57: The Historic Environment in the first instance and policies contained in the Gainsborough Town Neighbourhood Plan (Policy NPP1: Sustainable Development, NPP5: Protecting the Landscape Character, NPP6: Ensuring High Quality Design, NPP7: Ensuring High Quality Design in each Character Area and NPP18: Protecting and Enhancing Heritage Assets) and Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance, National Design Guide and National Model Design Code has also been taken into consideration.

In light of this assessment it is considered that the proposal is an acceptable development as it conforms with the NPPF and Policy S35 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. Furthermore, the proposed development will not harm the character and appearance of the locality, nor the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal will also not be detrimental to the highway network or harm the setting of nearby Listed Buildings.

RECOMMENDATION- Grant planning permission with the following conditions:

Conditions stating the time by which the development must be commenced:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To conform with Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Conditions which apply or require matters to be agreed before the development commenced:

None.

Conditions which apply or are to be observed during the course of the development:

2. With the exception of the detailed matters referred to by the conditions of this consent, the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents: Proposed Floor Plans dated August 2025 and Block/Site Location Plans (showing the red line) dated August 2025. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans and in any other approved documents forming part of the application.

Reason: To ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the approved plans and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local.

Conditions which apply or relate to matters which are to be observed following completion of the development:

None.

Notes to the Applicant

Advertisement Consent

It is noted that any new sign would be subject to the advertisement regulations and have not been considered as part of this application.

Reducing Energy Consumption in Existing Buildings

Policy S13 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan encourages the improvement of energy efficiency as stated below:

‘For all development proposals which involve the change of use or redevelopment of a building, or an extension to an existing building, the applicant is encouraged to consider all opportunities to improve the energy efficiency of that building (including the original building, if it is being extended).’

The applicant is therefore encouraged to use PAS 2035:2019 Specifications and Guidance (or any superseding guidance) for this proposal. Please see the link below:

<https://knowledge.bsigroup.com/products/retrofitting-dwellings-for-improved-energy-efficiency-specification-and-guidance-1/standard>

Human Rights Implications:

The above objections, considerations and resulting recommendation have had regard to Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol of the European Convention for Human Rights Act 1998. The recommendation will not interfere with the applicant's

and/or objector's right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence.

Legal Implications:

Although all planning decisions have the ability to be legally challenged it is considered there are no specific legal implications arising from this report.



Planning Committee

12 November 2025

Subject: Determination of Planning Appeals

Report by:

Director – Planning, Regeneration & Communities

Contact Officer:

Molly Spencer
Democratic and Civic Officer
Molly.Spencer@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

The report contains details of planning applications that had been submitted to appeal and for determination by the Planning Inspectorate.

RECOMMENDATION(S): That the Appeal decisions be noted.

IMPLICATIONS

Legal: None arising from this report.

Financial: None arising from this report.

Staffing: None arising from this report.

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights: The planning applications have been considered against Human Rights implications especially with regard to Article 8 – right to respect for private and family life and Protocol 1, Article 1 – protection of property and balancing the public interest and well-being of the community within these rights.

Risk Assessment: None arising from this report.

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities: None arising from this report.

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

Are detailed in each individual item

Call in and Urgency:

Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?

i.e. is the report exempt from being called in due to urgency (in consultation with C&I chairman)

Yes

☐

No

x

Key Decision:

A matter which affects two or more wards, or has significant financial implications

Yes

☐

No

x

Appendix A - Summary

- i) Appeal by Mr Sath Vaddaram against the decision of West Lindsey District Council to refuse planning permission for 'Planning application for 4 sections of railings on the front boundary wall and retrospective Planning application for retention of 4 piers above 1m from the ground level' at 23 Wragby Road, Sudbrooke, Lincoln LN2 2QU.

Appeal Dismissed – See copy letter attached as Appendix Bi.

Officer Decision – Refused

Costs Dismissed – see costs letter attached as Appendix Bia

- ii) Appeal by Mr J Waite against the decision of West Lindsey District Council to refuse planning permission for Erection of four dwellings with alterations to existing access in outline form with all matters reserved at Land off Common Road, Waddingham, Gainsborough, Lincolnshire, DN21 4SY.

Appeal Dismissed – See copy letter attached as Appendix Bii.

Officer Decision – Refuse.



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2025

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/25/3363760

23 Wragby Road, Sudbrooke, Lincoln LN2 2QU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sath Vaddaram against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is WL/2025/00107.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Planning application for 4 sections of railings on the front boundary wall and retrospective Planning application for retention of 4 piers above 1m from the ground level'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Sath Vaddaram against West Lindsey District Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The application is partly retrospective, the four brick piers had been erected, but not the railings. These were attached to a wall, with taller gate piers (one of the taller gate piers had been accidentally knocked down). The appellant has also stated that the application did not include the wall below 1m in height, the gates and the gate piers which are shown attached to the proposal. I have therefore proceeded on this basis.
4. There is also some dispute between the parties in respect of the gates and two gate piers and 9.99cm wall excluded from the application. Within the context of an appeal under section 78 of the Act it is not within my remit to formally determine whether the proposed development or any other development requires planning permission as suggested by the appellant. If the appellant wishes to ascertain whether the wall, gate and gate piers are lawful, they may make an application under section 191 or 192 of the Act.

Main Issues

5. The main issues is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. Detached houses set well back from the highway, within generous and, on the whole, well-vegetated plots contribute to the spacious and leafy character of

Wragby Road. I saw that a variety of materials are employed in front boundary treatments, however wooden fencing and railings are common, alongside low brick walls, and these are often accompanied by brick piers and hedgerows. Indeed hedges are the principal boundary treatment to some plots and this further reinforces the area's sylvan character. Moreover, this aspect of the area's existing character, close to rural fields taken together with the enclosing effect they have on the streetscene and the screening of the houses behind them all contribute considerably to the semi-rural character and appearance of the area.

7. The proposal seeks permission for four brick piers of approximately 2.8 m in height. These are positioned at regular intervals along the entire length of the 9.99 cm high brick wall. Vertical metal railings of 2.4m in height would be installed between the piers and larger gate piers. The brick used, and the railings are intended to reflect and complement that of the main dwelling.
8. The visual effect of the proposal cannot be disaggregated from the 9.9m wall in particular. The piers and railings alongside any gates or gate piers or wall would be seen as a whole and as single entity. The resultant visual effect cannot simply be separated from elements they are attached to, in the same way the visual effects of an extension to a house is not solely considered without how it affects the appearance of the host property or the composition of the resultant structure overall.
9. The 9.99 cm high wall almost covers the entire width of the plot frontage. The number of brick piers proposed and their spacing along the stretch of wall upon which they be situated would draw attention to the width. Whilst proposed brick and railings are high quality, they would be imposing, and overtly urban in their character. This combined with the proposed height and solid design of the brick piers in particular would form a hard built feature across the site frontage that would draw the eye when walking or driving past the site and from homes nearby.
10. The boundaries of homes on the northern side of Wragby Road tend to have some lengths of soft landscape boundaries. However, whilst ground planting and vegetation and trees would grow through the proposed railings, the imposing brick piers would still appear as dominant elements. In any event, there are no landscape details before me. The proposal would erode the verdant character of the streetscene and consequently appear as a discordant and urbanising feature in stark contrast to semi-rural character of the area.
11. I readily accept that boundary materials and their scale are varied in the surroundings of the appeal site. However, I have limited details regarding the properties and their boundaries at Manor Road, Scothern Lane and Sudbrook Gate. The pictures are not extensive, and the evidence does not suggest that they represent comparable development. Although there are other tall or solid boundary treatments nearby at 1, 5, 11, 19, 24, 30, 45, 73, 55 and 65 Wragby Road. Visually these appeared to be less imposing. None of them exactly reflected the proposal before me in terms of the exact design or composite site frontage coverage as the proposal before me. I have considered the proposal on its own merits, as the presence of other development does not automatically justify development which is found to be harmful.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. As a result there would be conflict with Policy S53 of

the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (April 2023) and Policy 9 of the A Neighbourhood Plan for Sudbrooke 2018-2036 (made 2019). These policies collectively seek amongst other things to ensure that new development, including alterations, relates well to the site, reflects and enhances existing character and distinctiveness. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to achieve well designed places and that development add to the overall quality of the area. For similar reasons, the proposal would not align with National Design Guide in the same regard.

Other Matters

13. I note there have been no concerns raised by the Council in respect of highway safety, biodiversity, trees or the living conditions of nearby residents. Similarly the Council has not identified that the proposal would infringe on any important or specific views. These are different matter to how the site is seen within the streetscene and the effect on the character and appearance of the area. The absence of harm in these respects weigh neither for nor against the proposal.
14. The appellant has referred to security, and I can appreciate the need for enclosure on a busy main road. However, it is not clear if a lower or other form of defensible boundary could perform a similar function. Nor is it clear that other security measures have or could be considered. There is no evidence before me, that the piers provide structural support for the 9.99 cm wall as there is no such survey before me. Accordingly, none of these other matters, either taken individually or together, alter my conclusion in respect of the main issue.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

K Williams

INSPECTOR

Costs Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2025

by **K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2025

Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/25/3363760

23 Wragby Road, Sudbrooke, Lincoln LN2 2QU

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
 - The application is made by Mr Sath Vaddaram for an award of costs against West Lindsey District Council.
 - The appeal was against the refusal of the Council to grant planning permission described as 'Planning application for 4 sections of railings on the front boundary wall and retrospective Planning application for retention of 4 piers above 1m from the ground level'.
-

Decision

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

Reasons

2. Parties in planning appeals normally meet their own expenses. However, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and thereby caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.
3. The applicant's claim for an award of costs relates to procedural and substantive matters. These are briefly summarised as follows:
 - misinterpretation of planning policies by considering elements of the proposal that were not part of the planning permission;
 - unduly influencing the public as the Council's initial description of development was not what the applicant applied for;
 - not determining cases in a consistent manner; and
 - failing to engage positively and cooperate with the applicant.
4. The applicant has not drawn my attention to any well-established case law that suggests the assessment should be restricted only to the elements that they considered were not permitted or permitted development. As I have set out in my decision letter, the elements shown on the submitted plans have not been shown to be clearly severable, and the four pillars and railings would not be capable of being built and then used for their intended purpose without the 9.99cm wall in particular. Therefore it was entirely correct and reasonable to assess the visual effect of the proposal in the context of the structure/s that are required to support them. The Council's assessment was not vague, generalised, inaccurate or unsupported by objective analysis, and therefore cannot be found to be unreasonable.
5. The applicant contends that the Council issued public consultation letters with an incorrect application description. From the information before me, the Council's

application site notice, notification letters, and the appeal notification letters dated all contain the applicant's version of the description of development. Therefore, although I cannot be certain that notifications were not sent out with a different description of development, there is no evidence this deliberate or manifestly untrue. The Council also appears to have rectified this before the application was determined, and before public comments were submitted. It has not been shown that this amounted to unreasonable behaviour, or that .

6. Consistency in decision-making is important both to developers and local planning authorities because it serves to maintain public confidence in the operation of the development management system. But it is not a principle of law that like cases must always be decided alike. The examples provided at 24 and 65 Wragby Road, were not developments that I have any evidence that the Council had received a planning application for. In any event, as can be seen from my decision, I have not found these or any other examples, including 30 Wragby Road, to be similar cases for these to have any overriding outcome on the appeal. Therefore I cannot agree that the Council have acted unreasonably in relation to its consistency decision making.
7. I have not been made aware of any enforcement plan the Council may have which sets out how they investigate alleged cases of unauthorised development. However, in relation to the enforcement action at 65 Wragby Road, the Council correctly identified that development is immune from enforcement if no action is taken within 4 years of the breach of planning control. It has not been demonstrated that the Council has acted unreasonably by undertaking enforcement action on this site in comparison to other sites, or that it could have acted any differently.
8. The applicant asserts that the Council should have been more pro-active even when considering a retrospective proposal. Even if the proposal is disaggregated from other parts, the Council is not obliged to suggest amendments, particularly during the short time frame within which it should determine planning applications. In my view, alternative scheme or amendments are matters for the applicant to address as part of the proposal, or through pre-application discussion. Determining the proposal within the relevant period, in my view is positive and proactive.
9. The fact that previous appeals have been allowed does not mean that the Council acted or misinterpreted case law or its development plan policies and therefore acted unreasonably in this case. There is often a degree of subjectivity in consideration of matters and those put forward in support of proposals at appeal.
10. Overall, none of the above to me, clearly fall within unreasonable behaviour which may give rise to procedural substantive award as suggested within the PPG. Nor is it apparent that an appeal could have been avoided. It is not within my remit in this decision to determine whether elements of the proposal that have not been applied for are permitted development.

Conclusion

11. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

K Williams INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by **M James BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/W/25/3365432

Land off Common Road, Waddingham, Gainsborough, Lincolnshire, DN21 4SY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Waite against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is WL/2024/00560.
 - The development proposed is described as “Erection of four dwellings with alterations to existing access in outline form with all matters reserved”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Planning permission for the proposed development of four dwellings was refused by the Council on 12 November 2024. An update to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was subsequently published in December 2024. However, the revisions made to the Framework are not considered to be determinative for this appeal.
3. The application was submitted in outline form with all matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) reserved for future consideration.
4. The draft Waddingham and Brandy Wharf Neighbourhood Plan was subject to public consultation in the first half of 2019 and the Council in its appeal statement has explained the emerging plan has progressed no further. I therefore consider very limited weight should be attached to the emerging neighbourhood plan for the purposes of the determination of this appeal and below I have made no further reference to it.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposed development on the core, shape and form of Waddingham and whether it would lie within the village’s developed footprint.

Reasons

6. Waddingham is defined as a medium village in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) 2023. Waddingham is situated within the open countryside, which largely comprises of arable farmland. The site is located at the southern end of the village and comprises a pocket of undeveloped land (the pocket) which helps to define the shape and form of the village. The pocket is partially within agricultural use and bounded by development on three sides.

7. The land immediately to the south of the site opens out into the wider undeveloped countryside. Adjoining the site to the west is arable farmland within the pocket and further west there are dwellings on The Wolds and Joshua Way. To the north-west is a further open field with a public right of way along its north-western perimeter connecting Joshua Way with Common Road. The public right of way appears to be in use, given what I saw of its condition during my site visit. Adjoining the appeal site to the north and east there are dwellings that form part of the village including The Laurels, Rosemount, Rosemount Cottage, Maple Lodge and Chapel Farm. Chapel Farm being a grade II listed building dating from 1740.
8. The proposed development would introduce four dwellings into the pocket. Whilst all matters have been reserved for future consideration, the submitted indicative site plan shows the proposed dwellings would be sited towards the western boundary, to the west of Maple Lodge and to the south of The Laurels. The land immediately to the east of the proposed dwellings has been identified as grassland with an attenuation pond. Along the southern edge of the site, there is an existing track connecting with Common Road and it is proposed that the track would be widened in places to provide access to the proposed dwellings.
9. The development of four dwellings would serve to partially close off the pocket from the immediately adjoining wider open countryside to the south and extend the built form of the village. The encroachment of development at the southern end of the village's developed area would have the effect of extending the village that I consider would not retain the core shape and form of the settlement as required to qualify as an appropriate location under Policy S4 of the CLLP.
10. Furthermore, whilst there is not a clearly delineated settlement edge, I consider the site relates more to the surrounding countryside than to the built-up area of Waddingham. There is a clear relationship and strong connectivity of the site with the expansive agricultural land to the south. Travelling along the access track in a westerly direction beyond the grounds of Maple Lodge provides a clear sense of entering the open countryside, with the pattern of built development being much looser as compared with parts of Waddingham to the north. The open vista looking south from the Maple Lodge access track would be retained with the dwellings in place, however, it would be reduced when looking west. Part of the site is also currently within agricultural use.
11. Users of the public right of way travelling east from Joshua Way would also experience a reduced vista to the wider countryside to the south with an increased degree of enclosure. That would be indicative of what would be an expansion of the developed footprint of the village which I consider would be harmful to the area's character. As such, the appeal site is not considered to fall within the developed footprint of Waddingham and the proposed development would have the effect of extending that footprint because the site relates more to the surrounding countryside.
12. The appellant has referred to four large open areas in close proximity to the appeal site, namely, the school playing field, the open area to the north of Rosemount Cottage, the Common and the area to the north west of the appeal site as more closely relating to the village than the countryside and which are reflective of the pattern of development. The appellant highlights that three of these areas were formerly protected as open space/frontages in the now superseded 2006 West Lindsey Local Plan. Their designation in that plan having been result of the

consideration of the character of the settlement and the integral role of open spaces within the developed footprint of the settlement. The appellant contends that these sites were protected as they contributed to the character of the settlement in the same way that paragraph 135 of the Framework suggests.

13. However, as acknowledged by the appellant, those open areas are no longer designated as open spaces and this appeal must be determined in the context of the current relevant policies, namely Policies S1 and S4 of the CLLP which accord with the Framework.
14. In addition, reference has been made to the Council's granting of planning permission for the dwellings that have extended The Wolds. However, that development was pursuant to the then extant policies contained in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017 which have been superseded by the policies of the CLLP 2023.
15. For the reasons given above, I consider the proposed development would not form part of the developed footprint of Waddingham and it would harm the core, shape and form of the village. Accordingly, the proposed development would conflict with Policy S1 and S4 of the CLLP.

Other Matters

16. Under section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 special regard is to be paid to the desirability of preserving the setting of buildings of special architectural or historic interest. The existing access track which would provide access to the proposed dwellings is adjacent to the grade II listed building.
17. The proposed development would include the removal of a small section of stone wall at the access track's junction with Common Road and the removal of trees and shrubs to facilitate the track's widening and surfacing. Having regard to the scale of the proposed development and its siting relative to the listed building, I consider there would be no harm to the listed building and that its setting would be preserved.
18. The provision of four dwellings would make a modest contribution to the supply of housing within the Council's area. However, I consider that benefit of the proposed development would not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

M James

INSPECTOR