

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING
--

Application No:	H16-0272-25	Applicant:	Mrs S Prowting
Proposal:	Proposed first floor side extension		
Location:	39 Helmsley Way Spalding		
Terminal Date:	4th July 2025		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
33	Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This a householder application seeking permission for a first-floor side extension. All materials would match the host.

The first-floor extension would run the length of the existing ground floor component, measuring 7935mm (depth) by 3271mm (width). The eaves and ridge height would be consistent with the host, set at 4650mm and 6100mm respectively.

The proposal has been amended during the application process, following discussions with officers, in order to reduce the scale of the proposed extensions.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Spalding as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The site is located towards the east of the settlement, located between the Coronation Chancel and the Spalding Academy. 39 Helmsley Way is located towards the end of a cul-de-sac, in a primarily residential area. There is a fairly high degree of consistency in designs within the area.

Relevant History

No relevant history.

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the initial consultation exercises, which can be viewed in their entirety through the South Holland website, can be summarised as follows:

Natural England

Application does not meet criteria for formal, bespoke response

Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority

Initial comments, dated 07/04/25:

Requests additional information - "The proposed site plan should show the parking - a 4-bed house should provide 3 parking spaces".

Revised comments, dated 25/06/25:

"The proposal is for side & rear extensions. The extension will see a three-bed dwelling with a garage increase to a four-bed dwelling without a garage. The Proposed site plan shows the parking for three vehicles. The proposal will not have an adverse impact on the public highway."

South Holland Internal Drainage Board

Initial comments, dated 10/04/25:

Objections: "The applicant intends to construct a two storey wrap around extension, extending to the side and rear of the dwelling, all within 9 metres of the aforementioned Board maintained watercourse. The d Proposed Site Plan states that the side extension will finish 10.6m from the edge of the property boundary. However, the drawing fails to include the measurement of the section of extension closest to the eastern states that the rear extension, measures 3m wide, therefore, this part of the extension will finish 3m closer to the eastern boundary than the side extension. We believe that the overall extension will finish 7.6m from the edge of the property boundary. We believe that the property boundary finishes on the brink of the Board watercourse. Resultantly, This proposal is unacceptable Planning and Byelaw Strategy as permanent structures must be positioned a minimum of 9 metres from the edge of the closest brink of the open watercourse. Therefore, the Board objects to this proposal."

Revised comments, dated 17.06.25:

"We are pleased to see that the applicant has updated their plans in response to the Board's comments. The applicant's initial proposal included the construction of an extension within 9metres of the Board's watercourse which goes against the Board's Planning and Byelaw Strategy. The applicant now proposes to construct the extension outside of the 9metre Byelaw Zone. In light of these changes, the Board would like to remove our objection."

Public Representations

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, no letters of representation have been received.

Key Planning Considerations

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.

The adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is 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, 2024 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Principle of Development

Policy 1 of the SELLP sets out the settlement hierarchy in respect of delivering sustainable development, which 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 need, whilst making more sustainable use of land, and to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural plots by developing in sustainable locations and at appropriate densities.

Policy 1 expresses this sustainable hierarchy of settlements, ranking the settlements deemed to be most sustainable in descending order. The most sustainable locations for development are situated within the 'Sub-Regional Centres', followed by 'Main Service Centres'. Lower down the hierarchy are areas of limited development opportunity including Minor Service Centres, with areas of development constraint comprising 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. The countryside is at the bottom of the settlement hierarchy and represents the least sustainable location.

The site is within the settlement of Spalding which is classed as a sub-regional centre within Policy 1. As such development will be permitted that supports Spalding's role as a service centre, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities.

As the site is within Spalding, development within this location is considered appropriate. In any event, the proposal solely relates to the extension of 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 in accordance with the requirements of the SELLP when viewed in principle. This is subject to the assessment against site specific criteria; including (but 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 in the following sections.

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

Section 12 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", states 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 NPPF, states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area (including beyond the short term) and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture 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. Developments 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, among other considerations.

Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP outlines sustainable development considerations for proposals; providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals. Furthermore, Policy 3 of the SELLP 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 NPPF 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 proposed extension is well integrated into the host dwelling, appearing as a natural continuation of the host dwelling. The use of materials to match the host and the integration of the roof pitch ensures that this is the case.

The proposal, to a certain extent, would be an outlier in the immediate area. In the immediate locale, there is a relatively high degree of consistency, where flat roof garages are prevalent. To a certain extent, extending above this existing component would break from the built form of the area. However, within the broader estate, comparable designs do exist which would help naturalise the proposal. In any event, the flat roof component is not particularly beneficial to the appearance of the area, appearing utilitarian and of no design merit. As such, the loss of this component would break from the uniformity, but would not worsen the overall appearance of the dwelling.

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 SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impacts Upon Resident Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF 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.

Policies 2 and 3 of SELLP sets out that residential amenity and the relationship to existing development and land uses is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

The proposed first floor extension would not significantly overlook its neighbours. The additional rear and front windows would not offer significant views towards neighbouring dwellings, and any views offered would be no more harmful than what is currently available to residents.

The frontage of the dwelling to the south, 41 Helmsley Way, is positioned further west than that of 39. This staggered frontage means that shadow cast from the first-floor extension would principally fall onto the side elevation of the dwelling. This prevents significant harm from occurring. In any event, the north-south relationship between the dwellings would reduce shadow further as the extension would not relate to the direction of the Sun's movements.

As detailed above, the scale and design of the proposal is considered to have 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 Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan in terms of impact upon residential amenity.

Highway Safety and Parking

Section 9 of the NPPF is titled 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Within this, Paragraph 116 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. Policy 33 further reinforces the need for developments to be accessible via sustainable modes of transport.

Policy 36 of the SELLP, in conjunction with Appendix 6, 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.

The addition of a fourth bedroom would necessitate an additional parking space under Appendix 6. It is considered that ample room has been provided for an additional vehicle. Therefore, despite the request from the Highway Authority to demonstrate parking provisions, it is considered that adequate room has been provided for the required parking on the site; and to request additional plans to show this would be unnecessary.

The proposal would therefore be acceptable and would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety in accordance with Policies 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Section 9 of the NPPF.

Flooding Considerations

Section 14 of the NPPF requires development plans to "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: (...) applying the sequential test and then, if necessary, the exception test as set out below".

Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states "the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding". The strategic flood risk assessment provides the basis for applying this test.

Paragraph 175 of the NPPF states that "the sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, except in situations where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates that no built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future (having regard to potential changes in flood risk)."

If, following the application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible, consistent with wider sustainability objectives, for the development to be located in zones with a lower probability of flooding, the Exceptions Test can be applied if appropriate. The process for applying the Exception Test is outlined within Paragraphs 177, 178 and 179 of the NPPF. Paragraph 178 states "to pass the exception test it should be demonstrated that: a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall"

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 SELLP 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 SFRA as a basis to apply the sequential test.

Within the SFRA the site is classed as danger for all, with a hazard depth of 2 metres. That being said, in line with Footnote 62 of the NPPF, there is no need to apply the sequential test or exception test in this instance.

While the risk of flooding on the site is significant, the proposed extension would not exacerbate this. The extension would be no more at risk of flooding than the host property and would make the host property no more vulnerable than it currently is. As such, it would be entirely inappropriate to resist the proposal on this basis.

Overall, when considering the development on balance, it is considered, given the mitigation measures detailed and recommended by condition, that the proposal accords with Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the SELLP and the intentions of the NPPF with regards to flood risk.

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 SELLP and the provisions of the NPPF when viewed as a whole.

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 these factors into consideration, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 33 and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 9, 12 and 14 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the benefits of the proposal; therefore, the planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

Recommendation

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