

**Metheringham Parish Council**  
**An**  
**Objection with Substantiative Comments**  
**To**  
**A Proposed Housing Development**  
**At**  
**Land North of the Old Mill Princes' Street Metheringham**  
**To**  
**North Kesteven District Council**  
**Local Planning Department**

**Our Ref: MPC 01/25**

**NKDC Ref: 25/0679/FUL**

**10<sup>th</sup> July 2025**

## **Summary:**

Metheringham Parish Council Held a Extraordinary Meeting on the 7th of July 2025 members resolved to make the following comments and observations and instructed John Frank Money the Parish Council's Proper Officer to submit these representations to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) before the 10th July 2025. The deadline as set out in the statutory consultation invitation to comment letter.

While Metheringham Parish Council (MPC) support the application in principle to provide seven new dwellings on the land north of the Old Mill situated of Princes' Street Metheringham. Members do have the following observations, concerns and reservations relating to the proposed development.

MPC welcomes the proposed bungalows adjacent to the Old Mill by virtue of reducing the height of these dwellings, subsequently it will have a less detrimental visual effect on the existing heritage asset.

MPC welcomes the siting of the proposed access road, by moving it further away from the B1188/Princes Street T Junction. With regard to the boundary treatment of the proposed access road. We do not think that gabion retaining walling is a sympathetic boundary treatment for a development, which is adjacent to a significant heritage asset. The Members would welcome a red brick constructed retaining wall incorporating the correct drainage and finished with a pan tile coping to weatherproof the top of the wall as we see within the conservation area of the village. Alternatively, a coursed sawn on bed limestone faced wall with a brick plinth would also be considered acceptable providing the rear of the wall retaining the soils would be constructed of hard baked red Class A/ B engineering brick or similar and topped with pan tiles. As previously mentioned,

With regard to number 90 Prince Street, we note in the Heritage Statement that the applicant believes this is curtilage listed along with the old mill. If we closely examine the OS sheet that was current on July 7, 1948. We will find a curtilage boundary line that is dog legged around an outbuilding included in number 90s curtilage. If we look further at this sheet we will see that the mill and the paddock have no separation delineations whatsoever. Therefore we contend that the whole development site is within the curtilage of the old mill when the planning act of 1948 became law, therefore we believe this may alter the significance of the proposed development.

On the original location plan the outbuilding previously mentioned is not shown on the proposed plans nor is it mentioned in the Design and Access Statement. We can find no evidence where this outbuilding is to be demolished and whether the reclaimed materials are going to be used within the development. This building is situated in the centre of the proposed access road.

While this may not be a material planning consideration as it is what you might call "hearsay" evidence: Metheringham Parish Council has been negotiating with parishioners who have a supposed interest in the Old Mill for some years without coming to any definite conclusion where the title ownership actually lies. These parishioners have advised the parish council that they as the owners of the Mill have both pedestrian and vehicular access rights to access their property covenanted into the deed to their property, if this is so we would expect the applicant

to show means of access on the block plan to the Old Mill. The means of access at the moment is from the track that is going to be dissected by the proposed access road. We do hope that the LPA will request that the applicant is made aware of this potential situation or possibly the LPA is already aware of it. We are also informed the Old Mill has a cellar or a room below ground level; has the applicant or the LPA had the benefit of surveying the building, thus enabling the applicant to assess the impact this would have on the proposed scheme?

The red line that denotes the extent of the proposed development is in places drawn away from the boundary lines shown on both the block and location plans. We do hope that this isn't going to create small areas of "no man's land". We would hope to see this either corrected or an explanation of why this has been drawn so.

When viewing the site from Google Earth the tree cover seems far more extensive than the trees shown on the block plan, would the LPA confirm there are no trees that need to be felled within - what we believe to be the curtilage of a listed building. We are also informed by a parishioner that there are some unique trees on the site, would you please inform the Tree Officer of this information.

We would now like to address the design of the proposed development: the street scene plan enclosed in the Heritage Statement document; while it shows the development as proposed when viewed from both sides of the proposed access road it does not include any existing built form; it is very difficult to assess the visual impact the development is going to have on both the heritage assets and the new development to the north of the site unless they are included on an elongated street scene plan. Members would like to be able to view such a plan before they could assess what visual effect the development is going to have on specifically the Old Mill.

Members are happy with the way the site has been dissected up into the various plot sizes and are happy with the density of the site being seven new dwellings. We are aware that number 90 Prince Street is within the ownership of the land who owns the rest of the site except the Old Mill. We would have preferred the proposal included either for the renovation of number 90 Prince Street, or if the dilapidation is to the degree where that would not be possible a replacement dwelling in its place within this scheme. We realise that the applicant has no control over the Old Mill. If this is not the case and the LPA has further plans for the Old Mill, we would appreciate being made aware of what those plans are.

We find the design of the proposed dwellings incongruous to the setting and curtilage of the heritage assets; being the Old Mill a Grade II listed building and no 90 Princes' Street which the applicant classifies as being curtilage listed. The applicant states they have taken their design from the Metheringham conservation area; the conservation area is some 400m east of the site, which is totally detached from the proposed development. The area adjacent to the Old Mill are predominantly designs taken from the latter end of the 20th century, whilst Alfred Avenue is pre-World War II and the bungalows along Sleaford Road are also just pre-World War II. Some were built during the 1960s and they are not particularly well designed architecturally, examples that should not be followed in the setting of a listed building and there are certainly no stone built dwellings in the vicinity.

We find the use of white render as a facade material unacceptable. Based our involvement in the pre-application conversations relating to a proposed bedroom extensions at the Lincolnshire Poacher situated within the conservation area, your Conservation Officer had real

issues with white rendering in conservation areas then. MPC were well aware of this when the owner of the Lincolnshire Poacher proposed a white rendered accommodation block in the hotel car park. The Conservation Officer was insistent on either traditional built form or use an innovative design such as copper or Corden steel.

Members do not agree the proposed development accords to both National and Local Plan Policy relating to design and amenity.

**NPPF paragraph 131,**

**12. Achieving well-designed places**

131. *The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.*

**NPPF paragraph 135. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:**

- a) *will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- b) *are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
- c) *are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*
- d) *establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;*
- e) *optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and*
- f) *create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users<sup>51</sup>; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.*

**CLLP Policy S53: Design and Amenity**

**All development, including extensions and alterations to existing buildings, must achieve high quality sustainable design that contributes positively to local character, landscape and townscape, and supports diversity, equality and access for all.**

*Good design will be at the centre of every development proposal and this will be required to be demonstrated through evidence supporting planning applications to a degree proportionate to the proposal. Design Codes may be produced for parts of Central Lincolnshire or in support of specific developments. The approach taken in these Design Codes should be informed by the National Model Design Code and where these codes have been adopted, developments will be expected to adhere to the Code.*

*Proposals for new buildings should incorporate the Design Principles for Efficient Buildings in Policy S6 at the centre of design. All development proposals will be assessed against, and will be expected to meet the following relevant design and amenity criteria. All development proposals will:*

**1. Context**

*a) Be based on a sound understanding of the context, integrating into the surroundings and responding to local history, culture and heritage;*

*b) 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;*

*c) Protect any important local views into, out of or through the site; Central Lincolnshire Local Plan – Adopted April 2023 Return to policy list page 117*

## **2. Identity**

*a) Contribute positively to the sense of place, reflecting and enhancing existing character and distinctiveness;*

*b) Reflect or improve on the original architectural style of the local surroundings, or embrace opportunities for innovative design and new technologies which sympathetically complement or contrast with the local architectural style;*

*c) Use appropriate, high quality materials which reinforce or enhance local distinctiveness;*

*d) Not result in the visual or physical coalescence with any neighbouring settlement nor ribbon development;*

## **3. Built Form**

*a) Make effective and efficient use of land that contribute to the achievement of compact, walkable neighbourhoods;*

*b) 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;*

*c) Achieve a density not only appropriate for its context but also taking into account its accessibility; d) Have a layout and form that delivers efficient and adaptable homes in accordance with*

We are not suggesting that this site requires that sort of innovative design but we would have expected that the facade and roofscape materials would complement the Old Mill and 90 Princes' Street. You will have noted that the Old Mill has some rather distinctive white brick banding courses built into it. Members resolved that the development ought to be built in high quality red bricks that replicate the handmade bricks used to construct the Old Mill, with the option of white brick detailing, together with natural slate roofscapes. In the Design and Access statement there is inference that concrete or other synthetic roofing material may be used. Members also believed those materials are totally unacceptable.

We are also surprised that the use of PVC windows doors etc is going to be allowed in such a heritage setting. Usually developers have to provide high quality timber constructed windows with the required amount of double or triple glazing in curtilage listed areas. If limestone walling is to be used, we would expect white brick plinths similar to what was used in the model village of Blankney, but certainly with no corner brick detailing. All external corners of the built form we believe should have the benefit of Ashlar Quoins and not brick detailing which is not usual in the limestone dwellings and other buildings within the conservation area.

Members do not agree the proposed development accords to both National and Local Plan Policy relating to a scheme which should be more a more sympathetic design relating to the heritage assets abutting the proposed development.

### **NPPF paragraph 210**

*In determining applications, local planning authorities 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.*

### **CLLP Policy S57: The Historic Environment:**

*Development proposals should protect, conserve and seek opportunities to enhance the historic environment of Central Lincolnshire.*

*In instances where a development proposal would affect the significance of a heritage asset (whether designated or non-designated), including any contribution made by its setting, the applicant will be required to undertake and provide the following, in a manner proportionate to the asset's significance:*

- a) describe and assess the significance of the asset, including its setting, to determine its architectural, historical or archaeological interest; and*
- b) identify the impact of the proposed works on the significance and special character of the asset, including its setting; and*
- c) provide a clear justification for the works, especially if these would harm the significance of the asset, including its setting, so that the harm can be weighed against public benefits. Development proposals will be supported where they:*
  - d) protect the significance of heritage assets (including where relevant their setting) by protecting and enhancing architectural and historic character, historical associations, landscape and townscape features and through consideration of scale, design, architectural detailing, materials, siting, layout, mass, use, and views and vistas both from and towards the asset;*
  - e) promote opportunities to better reveal significance of heritage assets, where possible;*
  - f) take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing non-designated heritage assets and their setting. Proposals to alter or to change the use of a heritage asset, will be supported provided:*
    - g) the proposed use is compatible with the significance of the heritage asset, including its fabric, character, appearance, setting and, for listed buildings, interior; and*
    - h) such a change of use will demonstrably assist in the maintenance or enhancement of the heritage asset; and*
    - i) features essential to the special interest of the individual heritage asset are not harmed to facilitate the change of use. Development proposals that will result in substantial harm to, or the total loss of, a designated heritage asset will only be granted permission where it is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss, and the following criteria can be satisfied:*

*j) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*

*k) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*

*l) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*

*m) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

*Where a development proposal would result in less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, permission will only be granted where the public benefits, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use, outweigh the harm.*

*Where a non-designated heritage asset is affected by development proposals, there will be a presumption in favour of its retention, though regard will be had to the scale of any harm or loss Central Lincolnshire Local Plan – Adopted April 2023 Return to policy list page 126 and the significance of the heritage asset. Any special features which contribute to an asset's significance should be retained and reinstated, where possible.*

#### *Listed Buildings*

*Permission to change the use of a Listed Building or to alter or extend such a building will be granted where the local planning authority is satisfied that the proposal is in the interest of the building's conservation and does not involve activities or alterations prejudicial to the special architectural or historic interest of the Listed Building or its setting.*

*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. Conservation Areas Significant weight will be given to the protection and enhancement of Conservation Areas. Development within, affecting the setting of, or affecting views into or out of, a Conservation Area should conserve, or where appropriate enhance, features that contribute positively to the area's special character, appearance and setting, including as identified in any adopted Conservation Area appraisal. Proposals should:*

*n) retain buildings/groups of buildings, existing street patterns, historic building lines and ground surfaces and architectural details that contribute to the character and appearance of the area;*

*o) where relevant and practical, remove features which have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;*

*p) retain and reinforce local distinctiveness with reference to height, massing, scale, form, materials and plot widths of the existing built environment;*

*q) assess, and mitigate against, any negative impact the proposal might have on the townscape, roofscape, skyline and landscape; and*

*r) aim to protect trees, or where losses are proposed, demonstrate how such losses are appropriately mitigated against.*

#### *Archaeology*

*Development affecting archaeological remains, whether known or potential, designated or undesignated, should take every practical and reasonable step to protect and, where possible, enhance their significance.*

*Planning applications for such development should be accompanied by an appropriate and proportionate assessment to understand the potential for and significance of remains, and the impact of development*

Members do not believe the applicant has fully embodied the contents of this publication into the application documents

### **Historic England The Setting of Heritage Assets**

*Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition)*



HEAG180 GPA3 The  
setting of Heritage /

#### **Further consideration:**

The Old Mill and no 90 Princes Street are marked for further consideration would the LPA update the PC of any information they hold relation to these building including any proposed plans.

#### **Committee consideration:**

Considering this is a NKDC linked application with Lafford Homes, Members assume this application will have the benefit of committee consideration before a decision is made.

#### **Solar Panels & Electric Vehicle Charging:**

From the plans and elevations it is difficult to ascertain if the solar panels are inset into the roofscape or sitting on top of the roofing material, Members would prefer the former to ensure the visual effect of the panels are limited. We expect the development will confirm with CLLP Policy NS18.

**CLLP Policy NS18:** *Electric Vehicle Charging The location of charging points in development proposals should be appropriately located to allow for easy and convenient access from the charge point to the parking space/s, and be designed and located in a way which:*

- a) *minimises the intrusion of the charge point on the wider use and access of the land;*
- b) *minimises the risk of vehicle collision with the charge point; and*
- c) *has ease of access for maintenance and replacement of electric vehicle charging infrastructure.*

#### **Biodiversity gain:**

We note that the 10% required biodiversity gain is going to be provided off site. Which is fine if the District Council wish to purchase a plantation or other lands to provide this elsewhere, we have no objection to that at all. Members would like to go on record and have resolved that the parish council are not interested in providing the LPA or the applicant with any biodiversity gain lands as all of the land the parish council owns is already being put to good use.

#### **In conclusion:**

We believe we have demonstrated that the design could be significantly improved by using alternative materials such as a high-quality red brick and if desired white brick band courses. or other brick detailing such a arches' etc. Natural slate roofing with high quality timber doors and windows. In our discussions we readdressed the Lincolnshire Poacher development where the Conservation Officer requested high quality timber windows and doors. We realise this is a market housing development by the development arm of NKDC Lafford Homes, we also realise that they will want to make as much profit as possible. But we would like to emphasise as a parish council we would not expect this to be achieved at the expense of a well-designed



development and if your profit margin is reduced because of a better design well so be it. Members wondered if any other designs or layouts had been considered such as ½ storey dwellings to reduce the massing of the development, or indeed accessing the proposed development from Quarry Close.

We would expect Lafford Homes to be treated in planning terms exactly the same a private development company.

John F Money Proper Officer Metherringham Parish Council

9<sup>th</sup> July 2025