

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H16-0437-24 **Applicant:** Country Court Care Ltd

Proposal: Erection of two storey rear extension to provide additional bedrooms, day space, storage, nurses station, assisted bathrooms and additional car parking spaces

Location: Ashwood Nursing Home 43 Spalding Common Spalding

Terminal Date: 13th December 2024

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
28	The Natural Environment
29	The Historic Environment
30	Pollution
31	Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy
32	Community, Health and Well-being
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
06	Developer Contributions
11	Distribution of New Housing
17	Providing a Mix of Housing
33	Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network
35	Delivering the Spalding Transport Strategy
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

Section 5 - Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes
Section 8 - Promoting healthy and safe communities
Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places
Section 14 - Meeting the Challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	1	0	0

PLANNING LIAISON OFFICER - FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT	0	0	0	1
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	2
RUBEN LOPEZ, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	2
WELLAND AND DEEPINGS INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	2	0
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	2
RESIDENTS	2	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

Erection of two storey rear extension to provide additional bedrooms, day space, storage, nurses station, assisted bathrooms and additional car parking spaces.

The existing care home provides 47 bedrooms, with the associated reception and lobby area, offices, day spaces, shop, hair salon, storage, a lift and stairwells, kitchen, dining room and laundry room. There are currently 20 parking spaces that serve the care home.

The proposed extensions will provide 1388m² of new development in order to provide 19 new bedrooms in total (following the internal alterations to the existing building) over 2-floors, along with associated day space, a nurses station, assisted bathrooms and storage. The total number of bedrooms in the extended care home will become 66.

Several bedrooms will be relocated, so where only 19 additional bedrooms are proposed, the new-build will contain 28 of the 66 bedrooms in total.

At present there are 26 full time employees, and 8 part time employees. The full time equivalent is 30 staff. With the proposal, there will be an additional 6 full time staff, and 4 part time staff. The full time equivalent will be 8 staff.

Site Description

The application site is located to the eastern side of Spalding Common, the B1172, which is a radial

road linking the A1175 from the south to Spalding Town Centre to the north. Spalding Common runs parallel to Cradge Bank and the River Welland, both of which are to the east, and both head north into Spalding.

The application site is some 1.8 miles south of Spalding town centre as the crow flies, and a 2.1 mile drive. The A1175 is only $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile to the south of the site along the B1172.

Ashwood Care Home itself is a mix of single and 2-storey structures, which are adjoined to the rear, and linked to the front with 2 flat roofed structures that form 'quiet lounges' within. The care home is constructed in light buff bricks, with brown concrete roof tiles and white windows. The existing care home provides 47 bedrooms and associated space, over 2 main floors of development, with the first floor of development being much smaller than the ground floor.

The site is located within the settlement boundary of Spalding on an allocated site STM004. The care home is adjacent to a housing site that has been built out in recent years and appears to be nearing completion. The care home is set at a lower level than the adjoining housing. The nearest neighbouring property is 2 Petrel Close which is a small dwelling set against the eastern boundary of the care home. This belongs to a short row of dwellings, all set at a higher level.

Relevant History

H16-0771-00 - Single Storey extension to front of Care Home. Refused 4.8.2000.

H16-0157-01 - Proposed Bedroom Extension to provide 10 additional bedrooms. Allowed on appeal 1.10.2001. (Not implemented).

H16-0407-05 - Proposed Bedroom Extensions (Renewal of Full Application H16-0157-01). Approved 9.5.2005.

H16-0405-08 - Additional bedroom accommodation in one and two stories, together with lounge spaces, staff accommodation and spaces for additional uses. Approved 18.09.2008

H16-0399-10 - Details of means of foul water disposal. Approved 12.7.2010.

Consultation Responses

Lead Local Flood and Highway Authority

Response dated 14 June 2024

Additional information required.

Queries about deliveries and where they would occur.

A servicing drawing is required to include a swept path of a pantechican entering and leaving the site in a forward gear. If they are to reverse into the site then they need to be sure that there is enough space without mounting kerbs and the footway opposite the proposed access. The access to the staff car park will be very steep. A note should be added to the drawing to say the proposed accesses will be constructed to Lincolnshire County Council Specification. The Section 38 drawing for the development shows a tactile crossing point where the proposed staff car park access is, it will be for the applicant to amend this with the developer should planning permission be granted.

Response dated 21 November 2024

This is an extension to an existing Care Home located on Spalding Common where the speed limit is 50mph, the existing parking is to the rear of the building accessed from the internal development road. The condition of the access road is good and will be adopted in the future as highway maintainable land. A Section 38 Agreement is in place for the adjoining development. There is a Tactile crossing point where the access is proposed to the Care Home - the Applicant will have to liaise with the adjacent Developer, Seagate Homes so that this is relocated. There are no known flooding instances in the vicinity of the site.

Highway Safety

Highway safety There are no recorded personal injury accidents in the vicinity of the site. It is not considered that there is a highway safety issue in the vicinity of the site. The access onto Spalding Common affords good visibility in both directions.

Highway Capacity

Staff will increase by 6 fulltime and 4 part time which will equate to a total of 32 full time and 14 part time. Visitors will park in the front car park accessed directly from Spalding Common - there will be an additional 19 residents maximum. The increase in vehicle movements will be small. There is no precise definition of "severe" with regards to NPPF Paragraph 115, which 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 would be severe." Planning Inspector's decisions regarding severity are specific to the locations of each proposal, but have common considerations:

- The highway network is over-capacity, usually for period extending beyond the peak hours
 - The level of provision of alternative transport modes
 - Whether the level of queuing on the network causes safety issues
- In view of these criteria, the Highways and Lead

Local Flood Authority does not consider that this proposal would result in a severe impact with regard to NPPF.

Travel Plan

A Travel Plan is requested. A Section 106 Agreement for £5,000 to co-ordinate and complete the monitoring process for the lifetime of the Travel Plan.

Site Layout

The total existing parking number is 20. Visitor parking is accessed from Spalding Common and there will be 8 spaces and this arrangement exists. Parking is to the rear of the building accessed from the housing development site and the proposed parking number will be 28. In accordance with our Design Approach Guidance there should be 1 space per 3 residents = 22. The parking proposed is in excess of this and it also accords with minimum Local Plan Parking Standards in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2019. Further justification was also provided which concluded that on an average day there will be 18 members of staff, some of which may choose to walk/cycle/bus/lift share. There will be 10 other spaces available for visitors/additional staff.

Flood Risk and Drainage

The site is not at risk from Surface Water Flooding, the nearest main river is the River Welland that is 0.3km to the east. The site gently slopes from west to east. The existing culverted watercourse runs along the western boundary of the site and serves as the existing outfall for the Care Home. The ground is clayey with naturally high groundwater. The existing Care Home has a private drainage network that drains to the ordinary watercourse culverted along the western site boundary. The proposed site currently drains overland to the south into the agricultural fields. No Ground Investigation Report has been submitted and Infiltration testing will be done prior to construction but it is unlikely to work due to shallow ground water levels. The proposed parking area may be suitable for lined permeable paving as a method of source control. There are no surface water sewers in the vicinity of the site. There will be below ground storage in the form of geocellular crates and additional storage will be available in the permeable paving and site drainage. Surface water runoff in excess of the designed storm event (up to and including the 1 in 100year plus 40% for climate change) will be retained within the site and directed away from the buildings. The drainage is acceptable in principle subject to a more detailed design. As Lead Local Flood Authority, Lincolnshire County Council is required to provide a statutory planning consultation response with regard to Drainage on all Major Applications. Therefore, the Lead Local Flood Authority does not consider that this proposal would increase flood risk in the immediate vicinity of the site.

Conditions were suggested in relation to surface water drainage, a Construction Management Plan, A Travel Plan, cycle parking, and a parking management plan. An informative was suggested in relation to Highway Informative 03 - new/amended access.

Ecology

Initial response

Insufficient information submitted with this application to assess whether the 10% net gain in biodiversity will be achieved. Required documents:

1. Habitat maps pre- and post-development require clearly labelled identifiers for each habitat parcel/type with which to link information within the Defra metric tool to the corresponding habitat parcel. Currently, these maps do not provide a label/identifier to easily link and compare this information pre- and post-development.
2. Copy of the complete Defra BNG metric file with all worksheets included. The file submitted with the application is incomplete/missing worksheets. In addition, each area habitat line entered should reference the label/identifier (described above) in its "comments" field.
3. A separate file or tables containing the habitat condition assessment criteria for each labelled/identified habitat parcel should be submitted separate from the Defra metric. The tabular format of the original condition assessment is required.
4. A BNG statement which states
 - i) whether the applicant believes the development would be subject to the biodiversity gain condition should permission be granted,
 - ii) the pre-development biodiversity values (reported in the metric) on the date of the application or earlier proposed date (e.g., date of field survey), and the competency of who used the metric tool,
 - iii) whether any degradation in biodiversity has occurred during or previous to these dates, and a description of the degradation and when it occurred,
 - iv) whether the applicant will require using off-site credits to meet the BNG requirement,
 - v) a description of any irreplaceable habitat on the land affected by development (as set out in column 1 of the Schedule to the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024.

Without the first 3 items on the list, it is not possible to properly assess whether the development can meet its BNG requirements, or identify how we can condition them.

Response dated 9 July

Concerns that this development will not meet its BNG requirement as proposed:

1. When did the area to the east of the site have hardstanding installed for machinery parking. If this hardstanding was put down without permission, then it should be considered degradation of the site. Baseline biodiversity of the site pre-degradation may be necessary. If hardstanding was not part of a previous permission, then the proposal would in fact be incurring a biodiversity loss of -0.43%.
2. The proposal includes establishing 0.0285 ha of "other neutral grassland" in "moderate" condition on the east side of the extension. This proposed habitat and condition will require specialized management to obtain (e.g., soil testing and nutrient management and disturbance mitigation). This is not feasible to obtain on the site and within the level of disturbance expected within the grounds of a nursing home without strict management measures. The applicants would have to submit a habitat management and monitoring plan (HMMP) pre-commencement for us to review and agree to. If we consider the HMMP to be unfeasible, then they will not be able to discharge the BNG condition and the development would be subject to a stop notice or other enforcement procedure.

In any case, because the proposal involves the creation of significant on-site gains (large numbers of trees planted and establishment of neutral grassland, then a s106 will be required to secure the management, as well as charging a fee to cover our costs related to admin and monitoring the site over 30 years, as well as any potential costs related to enforcement/mitigation should the biodiversity gains as proposed do not come to fruition.

Response dated 28 November 2024

A S106 agreement for BNG is not required because the value of biodiversity gains fall below our current definition of 'significant'.

A HMMP condition should be imposed to require them to submit a HMMP along with their

biodiversity net gain plan to discharge the biodiversity net gain as pre-commencement.

A note could be added to the decision to indicate the need for achieving 10% BNG requirement. They could purchase additional scrub and grassland/tree units from a habitat bank and provide evidence to with the gain plan pre-commencement.

Anglian Water

Section 1 - Assets Affected

There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Anglian Water asks that text be included on any decision notice if granted. Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991, or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.

Section 2 - Wastewater Treatment

The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Spalding Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows. Based on the above assessment Spalding WRC is within the acceptance parameters and can accommodate the flows from the proposed growth.

Section 3 - Used Water Network

Due to lack of information we are unable to make an informed assessment. The applicant has not identified a connection point and the sewers in the immediate vicinity are privately owned, Therefore, the development has the potential to have an unacceptable risk of flooding/or pollution from the network. Anglian Water will need to plan effectively for the proposed development, if permission is granted. We will need to work with the applicant to ensure any infrastructure improvements are delivered in line with the development. We therefore request a condition requiring phasing plan and/or on-site drainage strategy.

Section 4 - Surface Water Disposal

The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option. Building Regulations (part H) on Drainage and Waste Disposal for England includes a surface water drainage hierarchy, with infiltration on site as the preferred disposal option, followed by discharge to watercourse and then connection to a sewer. There are no details submitted to support the planning application for surface water disposal, Anglian Water have no public surface water sewers, so the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments in the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse. Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.

Informatives and conditions suggested.

Environment Agency

Response dated 13 June

The proposed development will only meet the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements in relation to flood risk if their suggested condition is applied.

The finished floor levels in the submitted plans do not correlate with the submitted flood risk assessment which ffl should be 1 m above the existing ground level, as the hazard and flood depth maps are up to 1 metre.

Suggest a condition that has finished floor levels to no lower than 3.2 mAOD.
-flood resilient construction shall be a minimum of 3.5m AOD.
-A flood emergency plan is produced

Response dated 9 July

The amended ground floor and first floor plans provide clarify on how the proposed raised finished floor levels are to be achieved, via stairs and a lift.

Suggested condition remains appropriate.

Welling and Deepings IDB

Response dated 29 May

SUDS are to be used for surface water disposal but a Drainage Strategy including a detailed plan has not currently been submitted. A suitable drainage plan would need to be available before the Board were able to provide appropriate comments.

Foul water provisions for the proposed extension should also be confirmed to the Board.

Response dated 15 October

Foul water is to discharge ultimately to the mains system but the proposed discharge of surface water will require an application for consent to discharge surface water being submitted to the Board which is subject to the agreement of technical details, payment of the £50 application fee and payment of the relevant development contribution sum. Based on the information provided to me via informal discussions with the consulting engineers I can now advise that the development contribution payable to the Board prior to connection to any watercourse is £2,378.10.

LCC Historic Environment

The proposed development lies in an area of high archaeological potential. The Lincolnshire HER records multiple near monuments and sites: MLI90797 - Cropmark undated enclosures and ditches. MLI90796- Cropmark prehistoric or Romano-British enclosures and ditches. MLI98977 - Undated Curvilinear Features. MLI23620 - Undated Cropmarks, MLI23621 Possible part of undated drove way, MLI98976 Undated Rectilinear Enclosure. Within the wider area, such cropmark evidence frequently corresponds with archaeological traces of Romano-British settlement.

Between November 2023 and April 2024, as a result of planning application (SHDC Planning Ref. H16-0668-16), a scheme of archaeological works took place in the adjacent Millfield Nursery Site NGR:TF 2344 2004. This included an Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation followed by a Strip map and record. The archaeological works revealed an additional settlement to add to the distribution of Romano-British settlement sites in the area around Spalding. This included settlement and agricultural evidence as well as human remain burials.

There is therefore a high potential for development on this site to have an impact on buried remains that should be recorded prior to their destruction. The applicant has not provided an assessment of archaeological/heritage potential for the site as required in the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) (paragraph 200). The proposed development comprises the erection of two storey rear extension to provide additional bedrooms, day space, storage, nurses station, assisted bathrooms and additional car parking spaces. Also, potential drainage and services connections. Groundworks and any temporary works associated with the development will have a significant impact on any surviving archaeological remains, resulting in total or partial loss, if present.

I recommend that if permission is granted, there be an archaeological condition for a mitigation strategy to effectively deal with this site. This will comprise a phased approach of archaeological investigation and mitigation work. This will initially comprise, but may not be limited to a trial trench evaluation of the site which should aim to determine the presence, absence, significance, depth and character of any archaeological remains which could be impacted by the proposed development as noted above and to inform a programme of further archaeological mitigation work which may be required if archaeological remains are identified in the evaluation. This will enable any remaining

archaeology which currently survives on this site to be properly assessed and recorded prior to their alteration or destruction.

SHDC Environmental Health

No comments.

SHDC Inward Investment

No comments.

Cllr D R Ashby

Support and no objections.

Public Representation

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, three letters of representation have been received.

- Proposal will massively detriment my home, the current requested plan will mean the upstairs extension will overlook my currently private back garden, the front parking requested will be in my front of my home (which the road is currently being used as parking for care home staff anyway as there isn't enough parking) the plans will actually make the parking space even smaller meaning more cars will park out the front.

- My home currently has a private garden, this current extension proposal would take the care home around 11 metres from the boundary and with a second floor would make my back garden entirely overlooked. - the current car park situation at the care home is in the proposed extension space at the rear of the care home which they are planning to build into, the car park is regularly full without the extension meaning that carers and visitors to the care home currently park outside my property as 'overflow parking', this proposed extension will potentially make the parking issue a lot worse. - the proposed new entryway to the staff car park is wanting to be out the front of my property, meaning all hours of the night there will be staff coming up and down the road to clock in, the way cars come around the bend at the present this proposed entryway will be an accident waiting to happen.

- 1. APPLICANT. According to Companies House the names applicant - Country Court Care Ltd, was registered as "Dissolved" on 15th August 2023. Are dissolved companies able to apply for planning permission? Would an amendment to applicant trading name need to be applied when this is clarified.

2. PRIVACY. Loss of privacy specifically concerning rear garden. When I purchased my property the plot I selected was based solely on having a small area of my garden that had the maximum amount of privacy available, the proposed planning application (specifically east elevation (pictured on 001 rev 3A. Series 21 proposed elevations) would significantly infringe this with the first floor extension windows overlooking.

3. PROXIMITY. The proposed building which includes a large courtyard area in between the applicants existing property appears to be a close distance from my immediate neighbours property. (Also adding concerns to point 2 directly impacting myself).

4. PARKING. According to the parking appraisal submitted (dated 15/05/2024) it states there is currently a total equivalent of 30 full time staff, the proposed plans would increase this number by a further total equivalent of 10.

There are 28 parking spaces included on the proposed plan (only an additional 8 spaces from current site), this seems insufficient given that the residents would also receive visitors, medical staff would be required to attend at times and also delivery vehicles to the site. Parking would overspill onto neighbouring development and main road from which access will be gained. (If access can be gained at all times as it seems a small area for bigger vehicles).

5. SITE INSPECTION. Has there been or will there be an inspection of the site specifically viewed from the east?

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.

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 2023) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Furthermore, where a Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted, this alongside the adopted Local Plan, forms part of the Development Plan for the District, and must be considered when assessing development proposals. In this instance, no relevant neighbourhood plans have been adopted.

The Authority is able to demonstrate a supply of deliverable sites equivalent to in excess of 5 years through the latest Housing Land Supply Assessment.

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.

The most sustainable locations for development are situated within the 'Sub-Regional Centres', followed by 'Main Service Centres'. Lower down the hierarchy in respect of sustainable development 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.

Policy 1 (Spatial Strategy) of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) indicates that within 'Minor 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. This policy goes on to detail that development within 'Minor Service Centres' will normally be limited to Allocated and Committed sites and infill.

The National Planning Policy Framework, (NPPF) (December 2023) outlines, within para 60, that "to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay".

Para 70 of the NPPF (December 2023) also emphasises the importance that the contribution of small to medium sized sites can make in meeting the housing requirements. ("Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built-out relatively quickly"). This policy seeks to ensure that there is a sufficient supply of homes and advises that sites of all sizes make a contribution to the housing requirement of an area.

The Planning Practice Guidance stresses that "the provision of appropriate housing for people with disabilities, including specialist and supported housing, is crucial in helping them live safe and independent lives....Providing suitable housing can enable disabled people to live more independently and safely, with greater choice and control over their lives." It goes on to say "disabilities can include, but are not limited to, people with ambulatory difficulties, blindness, learning difficulties, autism and mental health needs, which may generate a range of housing requirements which can change over time. To enable disabled people to live more safely and independently, local planning authorities will need to consider their variety of needs in both plan-making and decision-taking."

The application site in this instance is within the settlement boundary of Holbeach, which is a sustainable location in the settlement hierarchy. In context of this, the principle of residential development within this location is considered to be appropriate, comprising an appropriate form of development for the location and would be in accordance with the overall principles of the spatial strategy.

This application is for a C2 use which is defined in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) as 'Residential accommodation and care for people in need of Care.' This is a specialist type of residential accommodation.

Policy 17 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) relates to providing a mix of housing. It states that specialist care home provision should be located in the most sustainable settlements, e.g. 'Sub-Regional Centres' and 'Main Service Centres'. The location of the care home conforms with this policy.

As such, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the requirements of Policy 1 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, impact on highway safety and flood risk, 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 2023) specifically relates to 'Achieving well-designed and beautiful 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 2023), 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.

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 2023), 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 2023) 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 principle of a care home in this location has been established. The key to this application is whether or not the proposed extension would be acceptable due to its size, bulk, effect on any neighbouring properties, and the associated impact in terms of traffic as a result of the increased number of residents at the care home living within the extension.

The proposed extension involves two areas of day space accommodation including 40.5 square metres and 99.6 square metres respectively with an assisted WC in between, with 13 additional bedrooms on the ground floor, two nurses rooms, a sluice and connecting corridors.

At first floor level a further 15 bedrooms are proposed, with 2 stores, an assisted toilet, a further day space of 99 square metres, a nurses room, a med store, a bathroom and a sluice. Some of the bedrooms have integrated en-suites. At first floor level, amended plans have removed windows from two of the bedrooms closest to the neighbouring property, as a result of concerns expressed by the case officer in terms of potential overlooking.

The proposed elevations are similar to the existing, i.e. fairly plain buff brick with a variety of hipped and half hipped roofs and gables.

A cross section has been provided to demonstrate the effect on the neighbouring property which will be discussed in detail in the next section. Amended plans have pulled the extension back from the boundary so there is now a 14.4m gap from the boundary. Some windows have been removed in order to protect privacy.

A proposed visitor parking bay showing 8 spaces is shown on the site layout plan, with a further 20 car parking spaces. Staff car parking is within parking bays 9-28. An indicative tracking diagram has been submitted for a 7.9m refuse vehicle. 1.8m railings are proposed along the eastern boundary, with return around the southern portion of the site. The northern and western frontages show a 1m railing height. Whilst the extension is large, and has a utilitarian design appearance, the size of the care home is considered satisfactory given that C2 uses are a type of specialist housing that are in relative short supply in the UK, so expanding the care home, as long as it does not significantly adversely affect neighbours or affect traffic, is acceptable in principle.

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 2023).

Impact on Residential Amenity/Land Users

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) 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.

Objections have been received which relate to loss of outlook, loss of privacy, the size and bulk of the extension and parking problems, and the position of the access. One neighbouring property has the extension along its entire boundary, and the impact on this property has been taken into account. Amended plans have been submitted to address any impacts on this property to reduce overlooking and overbearing effects by pulling in the eastern flank away from the boundary. In addition, a key element should be taken into account in that the neighbouring properties are built at a much higher level compared with the existing care home. A cross section has been submitted which shows the extension to the care home to be at a lower level than the neighbouring property 2

Petrel Close in terms of overall ground levels. This means that whilst the extension is still large, it is at a relatively lower point, and this thereby reduces its overall impact.

The main body of the building has been moved further into the site, away from the dwelling to the east and, aside from a small projecting element, would now be over 14.4m from that dwelling accordingly. The submitted drawing shows the revised location of the extension, with the location previously shown by a blue line, so a direct comparison can be made. It is considered that the combination of the extension care home being at a lower level, compared with a greater separation distance, and changes to the design in terms of the position of windows, means that the extension is less likely to cause loss of outlook or visual intrusion onto the neighbouring property.

In addition, changes to the external design have been made that removes windows on the closest part of the extension to the neighbouring property, that would previously have faced the garden of 2 Petrel Close, these have now been turned to face north and south to avoid direct overlooking. It is correct that two windows will still face part of the the garden but these windows, due to the set in distance from the boundary, are now further away from the boundary, in excess of 14.4 metres.

As part of Biodiversity Net Gain, a scheme of tree planting is required to ensure that 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirements are met. It is considered that a tree planting scheme along the eastern boundary will further reduce any overlooking by the remaining windows thereby protecting privacy of the neighbouring property. It is suggested that this is secured via condition, but it would also be required as a pre-commencement condition to discharge mandatory Biodiversity net gain.

The extension will still be alongside both the front and the rear of 2 Petrel Close, but as amended it is now significantly pulled off the boundary. A 45 degree line from the rear of the neighbouring property is not cut, but is cut from a 45 degree line from the front - but this is at a significant distance away and is not considered to adversely affect outlook or loss of light to properties along Petrel Close. The main impact on the rear garden of the adjoining property has been significantly reduced due to the set in of the extension from the boundary. Whilst one objector said the entrance to the site would be near the front of their property, the Local Highway Authority raise no issues in terms of highway safety, and the entrance is not immediately adjacent to the front main wall of properties and is sufficiently forward so as not to cause a significant effect. As a result of the changes to the design and position of the extension, it is considered that the impacts on the neighbouring properties are not so severe as to justify refusal.

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. To ensure residential amenity is protected, a condition is suggested to ensure that the eaves and ridge height of the extension are now higher than shown on the submitted plans that show the cross section of the extension in relation to 2 Petrel Close, and that no external lighting is fitted along the eastern and southern elevations of the extension, thereby ensuring no light pollution other than from internal windows.

As such, the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of the Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023), and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan.

Highway Safety and Parking

Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) specifically relates to 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) 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 would be severe".

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.

Furthermore, Policy 36, to be read in conjunction with Appendix 6 of the South East Lincolnshire

Local Plan (2019), sets out minimum vehicle parking standards. Appendix 6 requires 1 space for 3 residents for care homes, plus 1 cycle space per 3 employees.

For a 66 bedroom care home the parking requirement would be 22 spaces for residents and 12 cycle parking spaces for staff. In total, 28 spaces are proposed for the extended care home where 20 spaces are provided at present for the 47 bed care home as existing. This exceeds Local Plan standards.

It is noted that objections have been received for inadequate car parking from nearby objectors, particularly in relation to visitor parking. The Local Highway Authority requested additional information and a parking survey. The agents submitted a parking appraisal, but the Local Highway Authority requested a parking survey. The agents did not agree, and considered the parking appraisal was adequate to determine. Given that the proposed parking conform with adopted standards in Appendix 6 of the SELLP, there are not grounds to insist upon a parking survey. The parking is policy compliant.

In terms of highway safety, there are no recorded personal injury accidents in the vicinity of the site. It is not considered that there is a highway safety issue in the vicinity of the site. The access onto Spalding Common affords good visibility in both directions.

In terms of highway capacity, staff will increase by 6 full time and 4 full time staff which will equate to a total of 32 full time and 14 part time staff members. Visitors will use the front car park accessed directly from Spalding Common- there will be an additional 19 residents maximum. The increase in vehicle movements will be small. There is no precise definition of "severe" with regards to NPPF Paragraph 115, which advises that "Development should only be prevented or refused on highway safety grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual impacts on the road network would be severe." Planning Inspector's decisions regarding severity are specific to the locations of each proposal, but have common considerations:

- The highway network is over-capacity, usually for period extending beyond the peak hours
- The level of provision of alternative transport modes
- Whether the level of queuing on the network causes safety issue.

The Highways and Lead Local Flood Authority does not consider that this proposal would result in a severe impact with regards to the NPPF.

The Highways and Lead Local Flood Authority have requested a condition in relation to a Surface Water Drainage Scheme, A Construction Management Plan, Travel Plan, and a secure Cycle Parking plan as pre-commencement conditions. Government Planning Practice Guidance as stated in Paragraph 007 Reference ID:21a-007-20180615 dated 15.06.2018 states that care should be taken when considering using pre-commencement conditions that prevent any development authorised by the planning system from beginning until the condition has been complied with. This includes wording saying "no development shall take place until"..or "prior to any works starting on site...." Such pre-commencement conditions should only be used where there is clear justification, which is likely to mean that the requirements of the condition (including the timing of compliance) are so fundamental to the development permitted that it would otherwise be necessary to refuse the whole permission. The advice goes on to state that a pre-commencement condition that does not meet the legal and policy tests may be found to be unlawful by the courts and therefore cannot be enforced by the local planning authority if it is breached. Development carried out without having complied with a pre-commencement condition would be unlawful and may be the subject to enforcement action.

The use of pre-commencement conditions for surface water drainage is considered justified as drainage can affect the height of the buildings, has to be installed before above ground work commences, and is often built into the internal roads. It is logical to seek consent for a pre-commencement condition for this condition. Equally, the use of a pre-commencement condition for Construction Management is also justified as preparatory work may have impacts that need to be managed prior to works starting on site, together with practical matters to determine to ensure local highway impacts do not occur during construction. The agent has agreed to such pre-commencement conditions together with other appropriate pre-commencement conditions not related to highways.

However, pre-commencement conditions for a Travel Plan and Secure Cycle Parking fail the tests as pre-commencement conditions. These type of conditions could be secured prior to occupation of

the development because neither the adverse impacts of a travel plan or the lack of cycle parking are expected to have such a detrimental impact on the local highway network as to justify refusing planning permission without these measures being in place given that cycle parking can be accommodated on site via vertical stacked cycle storage solutions, and the proposed parking is in excess of Appendix 6 Car Parking Standards. It is anticipated that parking and travel to and from the site can be managed in line with a Travel Plan that should be required prior to occupation, together with the installation of cycle parking, rather than prior to commencement. As such the wording of the Travel Plan and Cycle parking has been altered by the Local Planning Authority to ensure that these conditions are not pre-commencement conditions.

The car parking management plan is not a pre-commencement condition and therefore does not need evaluation under the planning tests for pre-commencement conditions.

The request for a Section 106 agreement relating to the monitoring of the Travel Plan also has to be assessed in relation to the planning tests for planning obligations.

Planning obligations are legal obligations entered into to mitigate the impacts of a development proposal. They run with the land, are legally enforceable and binding. They mitigate the impact of unacceptable development to make it acceptable in planning terms. Planning obligations may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission if they meet the tests that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. They must be:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

These tests are set out as statutory tests in regulation 122 (as amended by the 2011 and 2019 CiL Regulations) and as policy tests in the National Planning Policy Framework.

In terms of the request for a monitoring fee for a Travel Plan - the absence of a fee does not relate to whether or not the Travel Plan condition is imposed, nor is it related to the actual movements of staff or visitors to and from the site (the impacts of the development). It assists the County Council in administering the monitoring of the Travel Plan by providing resources to carry out that function. This means that the request fails the test to ensure that the obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It is not directly related to the development, and as a result it is not considered to be fairly and reasonably related in scale or kind to the development, particularly as no other matters require a Section 106 agreement. As all 3 aspects of the tests have failed, it is not considered justified, with the level of impact seeking to be monitored (as the parking levels are policy compliant) to require a Section 106 Agreement request for funding to be provided to the County Council for monitoring. It is not reasonable in planning terms and the Local Planning Authority do not recommend a S106 agreement on this basis as a result.

It is recognised that objections cited car parking issues and that the current car park is regularly full without the extension. Carers and visitors park in the street outside resident's houses. The extension is suggested to make the car parking situation much worse from the perspective of the neighbours. The staff entrance raises concerns about increased comings and goings and potential accidents. The use of a travel plan condition and a car park management plan condition is proposed to manage these aspects of the scheme, and the entrance has not been raised as a safety concern by the Local Highway Authority. It is considered that the use of conditions would satisfactorily mitigate concerns about parking.

Given that the proposal provides adequate car parking in line with the adopted Local Plan Appendix 6, the proposal would not conflict with Local Plan Policies 2, 3 and 36, and Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023).

Flooding Considerations

Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) 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: a) applying the sequential test and then, if necessary, the exception test as set out below".

Paragraph 168 details "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", with the sequential approach being required in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, with the flood risk assessment being the tool to demonstrate this.

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 site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but as it is an allocated site it is preferentially preferable in planning terms.

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.

The proposed development is at a high residual risk of fluvial flooding with the 0.1% (1:1000) + climate change event flood depths between 0.50m and 1.00m. Existing land levels are approximately 2.20m AOD. The minimum floor level of the proposed extension will be 3.20m AOD. Additional flood resilience measures will be included, where required including water resisting airbricks, Backwater valves and non-return valves, Electrical installation to be above 3.50m AOD. The revised drawings show an internal finished floor level of 3.40m AOD, so the drawings show a better finished floor level than required as a minimum by the Drainage Strategy and the Flood Risk Assessment.

The existing site drains via a network of surface water pipework located around external areas of the carehome, it does not include any formal SuDs or attenuation provisions so is assumed to discharge into the culverted watercourse on the site frontage at an unrestricted rate. The proposed extension benefits from a SuDs scheme including below ground cellular storage and permeable paving (provide for treatment benefit) within the car park and new extended drainage around the building. The volume of storage provided is designed to allow for restriction of flow rates from the area of the extension, to be restricted down to equivalent greenfield rates.

The total area of the site, including both the existing care home and the proposed land for the extension is 0.467ha, approximately half of this area (0.243ha/2430m²) is occupied by the existing care home. The existing care home surface areas or drainage connections are not being altered.

All new hardstand areas are accounted for within the design, a total area of 0.152ha/1520m² for the new roof area, car parking areas and exterior footpath meaning the total impermeable area for the whole site after development will be 0.395ha/3950m².

The greenfield flow rate for the total site area of the extension (0.244Ha) is 0.8l/s at QBAR which is the requirement to meet for new development.

The site is not identified to be in an area which infiltration is likely to work with deep deposits of clay and recorded groundwater in the vicinity at 2.2mbgl which may be seasonally higher. Whilst infiltration testing will be carried out in any event as part of the ground investigation, in the context of the geological conditions and the fact that the existing home and surrounding areas do not utilise infiltration it is deemed reasonable to assume this will not be feasible. Therefore the scheme utilises a lined cellular crate for attenuation with flows restricted to greenfield rate entering the culverted watercourse on the frontage of the site.

Overall, when considering the development on balance, it is considered that given the mitigation

measures detailed and recommended by condition, it is considered that 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 2023) in this regard.

Impacts of Climate Change

In respect of the climate emergency, section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) states that new development should be planned for in ways that: 'avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change' with care taken to manage and adapt where development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable; and that 'can help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design'.

Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) seeks to protect sites of biodiversity value, minimise and provide net gains for biodiversity. Policy 28 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) seeks to protect ecological networks and promote biodiversity net gain. BNG is required for the site and there is a very small shortfall to achieve the 10% Mandatory minimum. This can be achieved on site using additional planting and an informative is suggested to direct the applicant as the most logical way of achieving this. The BNG condition is also suggested as a pre-commencement requirement. A Section 106 agreement for BNG management is not required in this instance as the net gains are not significant enough to warrant such an approach.

In wider climate change terms, the care home is already in existence and the proposal is an extension. Additional planting is suggested to protect amenity along the south east corner which will also assist in meeting mandatory 10% Net Gain.

Taking the above into account it is considered that given the details submitted and those required by suitably worded condition, the proposal is acceptable in this regard. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with Policy 31 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023).

Other Matters

Policy 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) relates to the Historic Environment.

The proposed development lies in an area of high archaeological potential. The Lincolnshire HER records multiple near monuments and sites: MLI90797 - Cropmark undated enclosures and ditches. MLI90796- Cropmark prehistoric or Romano-British enclosures and ditches. MLI98977 - Undated Curvilinear Features. MLI23620 - Undated Cropmarks, MLI23621 Possible part of undated drove way, MLI98976 Undated Rectilinear Enclosure. Within the wider area, such cropmark evidence frequently corresponds with archaeological traces of Romano-British settlement.

Between November 2023 and April 2024, as a result of planning application (SHDC Planning Ref. H16-0668-16), a scheme of archaeological works took place in the adjacent Millfield Nursery Site NGR:TF 2344 2004. This included an Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation followed by a Strip map and record. The archaeological works revealed an additional settlement to add to the distribution of Romano-British settlement sites in the area around Spalding. This included settlement and agricultural evidence as well as human remain burials.

There is therefore a high potential for development on this site to have an impact on buried remains that should be recorded prior to their destruction. The applicant has not provided an assessment of archaeological/heritage potential for the site as required in the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) (paragraph 200). Groundworks and any temporary works associated with the development will have a significant impact on any surviving archaeological remains, resulting in total or partial loss, if present.

Archaeological conditions for a mitigation strategy to effectively deal with this site are proposed for a phased approach of archaeological investigation and mitigation work. This will initially comprise, but may not be limited to a trial trench evaluation of the site which should aim to determine the presence, absence, significance, depth and character of any archaeological remains which could be impacted by the proposed development as noted above and to inform a programme of further archaeological mitigation work which may be required if archaeological remains are identified in the evaluation. This will enable any remaining archaeology which currently survives on this site to be

properly assessed and recorded prior to their alteration or destruction. It is considered that the proposed conditions will comply with condition 29 of the SELLP.

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. Care Homes are needed to satisfy a growing need in the district and this need is expected to grow over the plan period. The development hereby proposed does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or amenity of nearby residents subject to conditions. There is no objection from the Local Highway Authority on highway safety or network grounds. The proposal complies with Local Plan Car Parking standards. A travel plan and parking management plan are suggested to manage parking in and around the site, and encourage more sustainable travel patterns. Lighting is suggested to be controlled along the eastern and southern flanks of the extension and the overall height above ground levels is set to no higher than the submitted cross sections.

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

Whilst a large extension, these types of Care Homes are increasingly required to meet demand. Amendments have been received which reduce the impact on the neighbouring property by pulling in the side of the extension from the boundary, restricting windows in the portion of the extension closest to the boundary with the neighbour, conditions that ensure that the heights shown on the drawings are not exceeded and the extension remains at a lower level compared with the neighbouring property, and other conditions are imposed to ensure no lighting on the eastern flank, a travel plan and parking management plan are required. Subject to the use of conditions the proposal is considered satisfactory.

Recommendation

It is recommended should be approved under Delegated Authority.