

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H11-0708-25 **Applicant:** Mr R Tilbrook
Proposal: Erection of two storey and single storey rear extension and two storey side extension
Location: 87 Little London Long Sutton Spalding
Terminal Date: 14th November 2025

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

- 01 Spatial Strategy
- 02 Development Management
- 03 Design of New Development
- 04 Approach to Flood Risk
- 36 Vehicle and Cycle Parking
- APPENDIX 6 Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
 Section 12 - Achieving well designed places

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	1	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	1	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	1	0	0	0
RESIDENTS	4	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder application seeking permission for the erection of a two storey and single storey rear extension and two storey side extension at 87 Little London, Long Sutton.

The proposed rear extension would protrude from the rear elevation on both the ground and first floor by around 4000mm and would have a length of roughly 8888mm on the ground floor, with a reduced width to the first floor, sitting at 6299mm. The proposed first floor extension would comprise a height that would be level to the eaves of the host dwelling, whilst being slightly lower at the ridge; with the overall ridge height of the dwelling also being proposed to be increased.

Changes have also been proposed to the existing ground floor side section, whilst a first floor side extension is also proposed. This would protrude from the side by around 3800mm and have a length of 8783mm. Finally, it would be constructed from rendered blockwork, concrete roof tile and anthracite grey uPVC windows and doors.

The application has been amended during the course of this application. The application has been determined based upon these amended plans.

Site Description

The site is located within the defined settlement boundary of Long Sutton as outlined in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP). 87 Little London is located in a built up residential area to the north of the settlement and is directly opposite the University Academy Long Sutton. It is constructed from brickwork with a tiled roof and white uPVC windows and doors, although the orientation often varies, it is of a similar design to the dwellings in the immediate area.

History

H11-0943-24 - Ground floor rear & first floor side extensions including alterations - Approved

Consultation Responses

Long Sutton Parish Council

The Council feel that the proposed works will double the footprint of the property and is a second extension to the property.

If allowed the street scene will be affected and the house will have a negative impact on neighbouring properties affecting their light, be outside of the existing building line, impact on the quality of life of neighbours due to the extensive and intrusive proposals.

The council consider the proposals to be an overdevelopment of the site.

The proposed rear balcony may also be considered as an intrusion into neighbouring properties as with the large extension protruding at the rear of the property.

Comments After Amendment 2

The council reiterate their previous objections to this application.

Councillor J Tyrrell

There was only one thing I could think of that might become a problem with this application was shadowing the neighbouring property, however just had a ride by at 5:30pm and the sun was at the back of the property, with that in mind I see no other reason but to support this application

South Holland Internal Drainage Board

No comments.

Lincolnshire County Council Highways Authority

Recommendation: No objection

Comments:

The proposal is for First floor rear extension (rear ground floor & first floor side extensions approved under H11-0943-24) and sufficient parking and turning can be accommodated within the site, and it does not have an impact on the Public Highway or Surface Water Flood Risk.

As Lead Local Flood Authority, Lincolnshire County Council is required to provide a statutory planning consultation response regarding drainage and surface water flood risk on all Major applications. This application is classified as a Minor Application, and it is therefore the duty of the Local Planning Authority to consider the surface water flood risk and drainage proposals for this planning application.

No Objections

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.

Comments After Amendment 1

Lincolnshire County Council as a Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority have no objection to Amendment 1 - Amendment to show reduced scheme regarding this application.

Comments After Amendment 2

Lincolnshire County Council have no objection to Description amended for Erection of two storey and single storey rear extension and two storey side extension regarding this application.

Sir John Hayes

I have recently been informed by my constituent about the above planning application for a rear first floor extension at the above property.

I share my constituents concerns about the scale and impact of this proposal on neighbouring properties and the character of the street scene. It does appear to be an overdevelopment of the site.

I am particularly concerned about the loss of privacy for adjacent houses, given the proposal for a Juliette balcony at the rear of the property, along with the possible loss of light. To this end, I would be grateful if you could treat my letter as an objection to this planning application.

Public Representation

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

The application was amended and subsequent to further assessment, it was considered that the description of development required further amendment, to better reflect the overall development proposed; which shall incorporate the extension previously permitted (extant planning permission), but not yet developed. It should be noted that these form part of this proposal and are assessed as part of this application.

Further to this, a re-consultation exercise was carried out, including the siting of a new site notice.

In this instance, six letters of representation have been received from neighbouring residents, and one letter from a Planning Consultant on behalf of a resident, these have been summarised below:

- Overbearing Impact & Loss of Outlook
- Concerns over Scale
- Overdevelopment, not in keeping with the street scene
- Privacy Concerns
- Overshadowing Impact
- Overlooking Impact
- Would remove all feeling of countryside and village life and immediately transport us to an overbuilt city feeling, oppressive and devoid of nature
- Noise Concerns

Key Planning Considerations

The main issues and considerations in this case are (but are not limited to):

- Principle of Development and Sustainability
- Layout, Design, and Impact on the Character of the Area
- Impact on Neighbouring Residents/Land Users/Land Uses
- Highway Safety and Parking

Evaluation

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In this case, the adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019, forms the development plan for the District, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (updated December 2024) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Planning Considerations

Principle of Development and Sustainability

The South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) sets out the settlement hierarchy in respect of delivering sustainable development that meets the social and economic needs of the area whilst protecting and enhancing the environment; in order to provide enough choice of land for housing to satisfy local housing need, whilst making more sustainable use of land and to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural land by developing in sustainable locations and at appropriate densities.

Policy 1 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) sets out a spatial strategy for delivering sustainable development across South East Lincolnshire to 2036. Policy 1 (Spatial Strategy) expresses this sustainable framework of settlements, ranking the settlements deemed to be most sustainable in descending order.

Policy 1 (Spatial Strategy) of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) indicates that within Main Service Centres, development will be permitted that supports their role as a service centre for the settlement itself, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities.

The application site in this instance is in Long Sutton as detailed by Policy 1. Regardless of such, the proposal solely relates to an extension to an existing and established residential dwelling and therefore, the principle of such development is considered to be appropriate, comprising an appropriate form of development for the location.

As such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable with the requirements of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) when viewed in principle. This is subject to the assessment against

site specific criteria; including (but are not limited to) the impact of the proposal on the character or appearance of the area, impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers, and impact on highway safety, which are discussed in turn as follows.

Layout, Design and Consideration of the Character and Appearance of the Area

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) specifically relates to 'Achieving well-designed places' and details that the "creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve" and as such, it is generally accepted that good design plays a key role towards sustainable development.

Paragraph 135, contained within Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024), states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area (beyond the short term and over the lifetime of the development) and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate landscaping. This goes on to establish that it is important that new development should be of the highest quality to enhance and reinforce good design characteristics, and that decisions must have regard towards the impact that the proposed development would have on local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting such as topography, street patterns, building lines, boundary treatment and through scale and massing.

Development proposals should also ensure that developments 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, among other considerations.

Likewise, Policy 2 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) outlines sustainable development considerations for development proposals, providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals. Furthermore, Policy 3 accords with the provisions of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024), in that it requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically-designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

These policies accord with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) and require that design which is inappropriate to the local area, or which fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area, will not be acceptable.

Proposals for new development would therefore require the aforementioned considerations to be adequately assessed and designed, including the siting, design and scale to be respectful of surrounding development and ensure that the character of the area is not compromised.

The proposal can be viewed within three fundamental elements: a two storey rear extension, a single storey rear extension and a resultant two storey side projection.

The proposed two storey extension would project from the rear elevation and would sit on relatively the same floor area as that of the previously approved ground floor extension; albeit, extending at a two storey scale. It would have a depth of 4000mm and a total length of 6299mm. Notwithstanding this, in regards to size and floor space, it would appear acceptable and proportionate, and in respect of the floor area, would not extend or overhang the previous proposal and would sit well within the plot.

Further to this, the proposed rear extension would comprise an eaves height that would be level to the main dwelling, sitting at 5000mm; whilst the ridge height is proposed as to be lesser in height than that of the host dwelling, at 7600mm; albeit, the height of the dwelling is also to be increased. This would result in the this extension, in respect of its scale and height in isolation, appearing subservient and subordinate in relation to the main host dwelling.

It could be considered that as a result of extending the house further beyond the rear, that this creates further built form and a large mass of brickwork/development. Whilst this is noted, the siting of this extension, albeit partially visible, would be to the rear of the site and would not be a prominent feature within the surrounding context particularly when considering the aforementioned side addition that is proposed, and previously permitted. In this regard, the proposed two storey

extension would not project any further beyond that of the previously permitted single storey extension, and as such, it is therefore considered to be acceptable and proportionate.

It is worth noting that despite a single storey, ground floor rear extension and a two storey side extension, having previously been approved under a separate application, the plans submitted in this instance comprise both existing and proposed plans, with the previously permitted additions being illustrated as 'proposed' features, appearing solely within the proposed drawings. The case officers site visit also demonstrated that these additions, as previously permitted have yet to be constructed or substantially completed.

Further to the officers assessment and further to resultant discussions with the applicant, these elements were also referred to within the description of development and form part of this application. Notwithstanding the fact that they have been previously permitted, in light of the above, it is appropriate for these extensions to be assessed and discussed in this report.

The previously permitted application on site comprised a single storey rear extension that projected from the rear elevation by 4000mm and ran the entire width of the host property, sitting at 8888mm. Whilst this was previously permitted as a single storey rear extension, the proposal before us would comprise a two storey extension, fundamentally offering a first floor above that of the previously permitted extension; albeit, with the two storey element being at a reduced width of approximately 6.3m, with the remaining 2.5m being retained as a single storey element, towards the north.

An assessment of the additional enlargement has been provided above, which in essence comprises a two storey extension. This is not considered to cause any substantial harm to the street scene, due to its siting, coupled with the its visibility from the highway and public vantage points in any case.

The side extension as proposed would project from the side elevation, when by approximately 3517mm and would extend the full length of the property, sitting at around 8783mm.

This side extension, which replaces a single storey garage, was previously approved under the earlier application on site, with this aspect of the scheme being unaltered. This addition was, and is still, considered to be acceptable and proportionate. During the assessment of this element of the scheme within the previous application, it was concluded that "A resident objection was received stating the following 'The plan to build on top of the garage is unacceptable', it is not considered that building on this section would be unsuitable as there is no set design along Little London for them to accord to, whilst there are multiple properties which look similar there are various designs in terms of shape, size, materials etc. This therefore should not create an adverse impact".

Finally, it should also be discussed that the overall roof height of the dwelling would be increased to alter the pitch and design of the roof. There would be an increase from 7500mm to 8100m. Again, this was approved under a previous application and therefore, it would be unreasonable for the Local Planning Authority to resist such an enlargement, with the applicants having the opportunity to carry out this development under the extant permission on site. In any event, it is considered that this enlargement is not significant and therefore should not cause adverse material harm to the street scene or locality.

In relation to the proposed materials, the walls would feature rendered blockwork to match the previously approved materials. This was off white render and timber cladding. The roof would feature concrete tiles to match, whilst the windows and doors would be constructed from anthracite grey uPVC. The roof tiles and windows are considered to be acceptable. As the walls would use the same materials as the previously approved scheme, the LPA are comfortable with those proposed and do not consider these to give rise to an unacceptable impact upon the character or appearance of the area. The following text has been taken from this approval which justified why this material was considered to be acceptable, the same can be applied here: *'No. 101 Little London, seven doors north of this site, features white render and black cladding on the front elevation which would be somewhat similar to what 87 Little London proposes. Furthermore, both 103 and 105 feature similar designs. Therefore, this makes this proposal more acceptable and should not materially harm the street scene or locality'.*

Taking account of the design, scale and nature of the development, as detailed above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable. The proposal would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area and would therefore be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework

(December 2024).

Impact on Residential Amenity/Land Users

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) states that development should 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; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Policies 2 and 3 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) sets out that residential amenity and the relationship to existing development and land uses is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

The proposed development comprises a two storey side, two storey rear and a single storey rear extension, alongside the increase in height of the dwelling.

In respect of the two storey side extension, this addition has previously been considered by the Local Planning Authority under application H11-0943-24 and was subsequently approved. When considering this element of the proposal, it was previously considered that: *"the first floor side extension would be level with No. 89 to both the front and rear elevations meaning it will not extend beyond the build line and should not cast a shadow to the front or rear garden.* The previous assessment of this case went on to consider that given this extent of enlargement, coupled with the positioning of the site, it was not considered to cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Naturally, the sun will rise in the east and set in the west travelling south. To the east and west there would be no unacceptable harm, as a result of the two storey side extension, due to the distance to the western neighbour and there being no dwellings to the east. Any resultant increase in the height of the dwelling itself would also not result in a significant impact in this regard.

The previous assessment also identified that *"There are also no side windows on the first floor extension meaning it could not overlook through this. A window for Bedroom 4 is located on the rear elevation; however, this is similar to the existing layout of the dwelling and should only allow them to face into their own rear garden. It would more than likely be no different to how the surrounding dwellings are set out.*

It is considered that, as per that previously assessed, the two storey side extension would not give rise to an unacceptable or significant adverse impact upon the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

With regard to the two storey rear extension, there would be no unacceptable or significant impact to the east and west due to the distance to the western neighbour and there being the host dwelling to the east to which the extension adjoins. Any overshadowing that would occur would affect the northern neighbour mostly. The LPA do not consider the potential overshadowing impacts to be material or significant enough to warrant a refusal. The height of this two storey extension sits at approximately 7500mm, which is considered to be acceptable in this instance. It should be noted that the height of the dwelling would also increase following the completion of these works to around 8100mm. However, this would be somewhat a modest scale and would not increase to a harmful extent; not giving rise to an unacceptable impact. It should also be noted that this enlargement was previously permitted and remains part of an extant permission on site, which can be developed irrespective of the outcome of this application.

Moving on from this, a key justification for the acceptability of the rear extension is that the overall height would be no more than the host dwelling in its current state, with the host dwelling then being increased beyond this. Therefore, any issues that could arise would not result in a significant increase in terms of a materially harmful level in this regard. Weight should be given to the fact that the extension projects out by around 4000mm at a two storey capacity and gives more room for potential harm to be caused to this aforementioned northern neighbour. However, due to the positioning of the host dwelling and the immediately neighbouring plot to the north, any potential harm would be mostly caused during the middle part of the day and not when the sun rises and sets.

The host dwelling lies to the south of the neighbouring plot and as such, with the sun rising from the east, the host dwelling as existing, already provides the notable built form from this direction which

would, as existing, lessen the light in this regard. The proposed rear extension, although two storey in scale, given the siting of the host dwelling as existing in respect of its relationship with this northern plot, would not give rise to an unacceptable increase in harm in this regard.

The Local Planning Authority received a larger scheme in respect of this rear extension through the initial plans submitted as part of this application. Further to discussions, it was requested that the rear extension was reduced, as to increase its separation, at a two storey scale, from this northern neighbour. As such, the amended plans as determined, comprise a reduced scheme, which allows for a single storey projection within its closest proximity along this rear elevation.

Public representations during the consultation period have raised concerns regarding overshadowing which have been noted; however, this scheme, as amended, is not considered to cause any material loss of light for a significant period of time throughout the course of the day, which would lead to an unacceptable or significant adverse impact to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. As such, this is considered to be an acceptable proposal in this regard.

The extension approved under the previous scheme which have been assessed under this report also, are not considered to cause any material harm. The potential impact of this was discussed before, the details outlined in this report remain and therefore there should be no material overshadowing as a result of this either.

In respect of the layout, there would be two new windows along the rear elevation. These would serve an en-suite and master bedroom. A condition would be attached to the decision notice to ensure the en-suite window is obscure glazed to minimise any overlooking potential through this. Whilst the window for the master bedroom could provide some outlook, this would not result in a material loss of privacy that would warrant refusal in this case. The previous proposal approved windows for two bedrooms on the rear elevation. Although the new bedroom window would extend further back, this would not result in any new additional concerns or outlook in comparison to what could be carried out with the extant permission. As such, no material overlooking or loss of privacy should occur following construction.

Naturally, after the initial construction, which itself would take place over a short period, minimal additional noise pollution would be caused as a result of the development and the neighbour should not be greatly harmed through an increase in noise.

As detailed above, the scale and design of the proposal is considered to be such that there would be no significant or unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties or land users, when also taking account of the conditions recommended. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of the Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024), and Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019).

Highway Safety and Parking

Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) specifically relates to 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) advises that "development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios".

In respect of highway matters, Policy 2 details that proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to access and vehicle generation. Policy 3 details that development proposals will demonstrate how accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways will be secured, where they are relevant to the proposal.

Further, Policy 36, to be read in conjunction with Appendix 6, of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019), sets out minimum vehicle parking standards and requires at least two spaces for dwellings of up to three bedrooms and three spaces for dwellings with four or more bedrooms.

There would be an increase from three to four bedrooms meaning that at least three vehicle parking spaces must be provided on site to accord to Appendix 6. The proposed block plan clearly indicates

room for three vehicles to be stored safely off-street. LCC Highways have also raised no objections from a highway safety point of view and the development should not cause a severe impact on the highway.

The proposal would therefore be acceptable and would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety in accordance with Policies 2, 3 and 36 the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019), and Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024).

Flood Risk

Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) explains that "Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere".

This goes on to state, within Paragraph 172, that all plans "should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development - taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change - so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property. They should do this, and manage any residual risk, by: a) applying the sequential test and then, if necessary, the exception test as set out below".

It is important to note that whilst minor developments such as householders must meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments, they should not be subject to the sequential test, nor the exception test, as outlined in Paragraph 176 and to be read in conjunction with footnote 62.

The site lies within Flood Zones 3 of the Environment Agency's Flood Maps. These have been created as a tool to raise awareness of flood risk with the public and partner organisations, such as Local Authorities, Emergency Services and Drainage Authorities. The Maps do not take into account any flood defences.

The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) provides an overview of how flood risk has been considered in shaping the proposals of the Local Plan; including the spatial strategy and the assessment of housing and employment sites. Policy 4 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) is clear in that "Development proposed within an area at risk of flooding (Flood Zones 2 and 3 of the Environment Agency's flood map or at risk during a breach or overtopping scenario as shown on the flood hazard and depths maps in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment) will be permitted" in instances where specific criteria is met.

It is worth noting that large parts of the district of South Holland lie within Flood Zone 3. It is therefore necessary to use the refined flood risk information (Hazard and Depth maps) within the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017) as a basis to apply the sequential test.

Despite the property being within Flood Zone 3 and Danger for Most within the SFRA, as the application is purely for extensions to an existing residential property; there would not be any significant harm raised and it would not materially increase the flood risk for the site and surrounding area in a harmful way beyond that previously permitted, due to it being located on the same footprint to the previously approved ground floor rear extension.

Overall, when considering the development on balance, it is considered that given the mitigation measures detailed and recommended by condition, the proposal accords with Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and the intentions of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) in this regard.

Planning Balance

As detailed above, Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposal represents appropriate development within the defined settlement boundary. The development hereby proposed does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality,

or amenity of nearby residents, and provides adequate parking, whilst conforming with the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) when viewed as a whole.

In this instance, there are no material considerations that weigh against the proposal and as such, the planning balance is in favour of the development.

Additional Considerations

Public Sector Equality Duty

In making this decision the Authority must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act. This means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in discharging its functions) to:

- A. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act
- B. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. This may include removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the special needs of those with a protected characteristic; encouraging participation in public life (or other areas where they are underrepresented) of people with a protected characteristic(s).
- C. Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The PSED must be considered as a relevant factor in making this decision but does not impose a duty to achieve the outcomes in s.149. It is only one factor that needs to be considered, and may be balanced against other relevant factors.

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case will have a disproportionately adverse impact on a protected characteristic.

Human Rights

In making a decision, the Authority should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as South Holland District Council to act in a manner that is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. The Authority is referred specifically to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property).

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case interferes with local residents' right to respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general public interest and the recommendation is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

Conclusion

Taking the above considerations into account, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 36 (including Appendix 6) of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019), along with the identified sections contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024). There are no significant factors in this case that indicate against the proposal and outweigh the consideration in favour of the proposal and the policies referred to above.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be approved under Delegated Authority.