

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H16-0773-26 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Drury
Proposal: Erection of two storey dwelling
Location: Adjacent To 26 Stonegate Spalding Lincolnshire
Terminal Date: 9th October 2026

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
10	Meeting Assessed Housing Requirements
11	Distribution of New Housing
17	Providing a Mix of Housing
28	The Natural Environment
30	Pollution
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework August 2026

Section 2 - Plan-making policies (PM1 - 17)
Section 3 - Decision-making policies (DM1 - 10)
Section 4 - Achieving sustainable development (S1 - S6)
Section 6 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes (HO1 - 13)
Section 12 - Making effective use of land (L1 - 3)
Section 14 - Achieving well-designed places (DP1 - 4)
Section 15 - Promoting sustainable transport (TR1 - 8)
Section 17 - Pollution, public protection and security (P1 - 6)
Section 18 - Managing flood risk and coastal change (F1 - 9)
Section 19 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (N1 - 9)

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	0	1	0
PLANNING LIAISON OFFICER - FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT	0	0	0	1

HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	1	0
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	3

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The proposal seeks full planning permission for the erection of a detached two-storey dwelling within part of the existing garden of 26 Stonegate which is a detached dwelling located to the north-west of the site. The dwelling is proposed to feature two gable end roof forms with a mixture of brickwork and cladding.

Site Description

The site comprises land at 26 Stonegate, Spalding. The site comprises a spacious plot when compared to the surrounding dwellings. For example, there are terraced properties to the west of the site, located on Lime Court. The nearest dwellings on Stone Gate feature plots of various length and sizes and there is a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings.

The site is located within the settlement boundary of Spalding as identified within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and the accompanying policies map.

The site is within Flood Zone 3, as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps.

Planning History

H16-0819-94: (Full Application) Extension to kitchen, utility and garage - approved 11th October 1994

H16-1073-25: (Full Application) Proposed self build dwelling - withdrawn 13th August 2026

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the consultation period are summarised below. The responses can be viewed in their entirety on South Holland District Council's website.

Cllr D R Ashby:

Land drainage problems to sort but the layout is fine.

Conservation Officer:

I have no objection to the proposal on built heritage grounds. The proposed dwelling is not considered to have an impact on nearby heritage assets, including Ayscoughfee Hall, due to the intervening buildings between the site and these assets.

Ecology Officer:

We are happy with the siting and level of provision of ecological enhancements for this application.

We believe that the habitats on site have the potential to support nesting birds. It is an offence under Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act of 1981(WCA 1981) to intentionally take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while it is use or being built. Therefore, we request a condition requiring that: Works should not be carried out in the main nesting season (March 1st - August 31st). If not possible then a suitably qualified ecologist must perform a breeding bird survey of the site prior to any works beginning onsite. Any active nests discovered during inspections will be protected with a suitable exclusion buffer (of appropriate size to the species) to prevent disturbance and monitored until the nest is no longer active / all chicks have fledged, when the ecologist will provide a sign off for clearance work to continue.

The proposal is exempt from BNG as the site area is less than 0.2ha.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS:

This proposal is for the erection of a two-storey dwelling. The access location would remain unchanged and would be widened to facilitate two-way vehicle movements. Whilst a width of 5 metres is proposed, the Highway Authority considers that a reduced width of approximately 4.2 metres may also be acceptable, with the final design to be determined through the Section 184 application process. Adequate parking provision is available for both the proposed dwelling and the existing host dwelling. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. As Lead Local Flood Authority, Lincolnshire County Council is required to provide a statutory planning consultation response with regard to 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. Highway informative 03 is recommended.

Lincolnshire County Council - Historic Environment Officer:

Having reviewed the application documents and the updated available Historic Environment information for this application, the proposal is unlikely to have an impact on significant archaeological remains. Consequently, no further archaeological input is necessary for this application.

Environment Agency:

The proposed development will only meet the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements in relation to flood risk if planning conditions are included requiring compliance with the submitted FRA, preventing the ground floor from being used as habitable accommodation and restricting permitted development rights for extensions for habitable accommodation.

Environmental Protection:

No comments.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board:

Byelaw 3 (Surface Water): The applicant has indicated that they intend to dispose of surface water via infiltration, however we cannot see that the viability of this proposal has been evidenced. We recommend that ground investigation is carried out to determine infiltration potential, followed by testing in line with BRE Digest 365 if onsite material is considered favourable for infiltration. If infiltration is not feasible at this site, following the drainage hierarchy we would expect the applicant to propose to discharge surface water to a watercourse. In this case, consent would be required under Byelaw 3. The Board recommend that any discharge is in line with the National standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) published in June 2025. Further to the National Standards for SuDS, the Board's policy is to restrict discharges to 2/l/s/ha or annual average flood flow rate (QBar or QMed), whichever is higher. Please note that any consent granted for the discharge of surface water is likely to be subject to a Surface Water Development Contribution fee (SWDC) as outlined within our Development Control Charges and Fees.

Byelaw 3 (Treated Foul Water): We note that the applicant intends to dispose of foul water to a main sewer. Should the applicant's proposals change to include the discharge of treated foul water to a watercourse, consent would be required under Byelaw 3.

Section 23, Land Drainage Act 1991: We are not aware of any riparian owned/maintained watercourses within or adjacent to the site boundary, however this should be confirmed by the applicant. Should the applicant's proposals include works to alter a watercourse, or if works are proposed to alter a watercourse at any time in the future, consent would be required under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and byelaw 4).

Byelaw 10: There are no Board arterial watercourses within or adjacent to the site boundary therefore Byelaw 10 does not apply.

Cllr M E Le Sage: No response received.

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 representations from members of the public were received.

Key Planning Considerations

Development Plan

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, August 2026 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

There are no adopted Neighbourhood Plans for the area within which the site is located.

The main issues and considerations in this case include the following:

- Principle of Development;
- Design, Layout and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area;
- Impact on Residential Amenity;
- Highway Safety and Parking;
- Flood Risk and Drainage; and
- Biodiversity Net Gain.

These matters are assessed in turn below.

Principle of Development

Policy 1 of the Local Plan 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 boundary of Spalding which is a Sub-Regional Centre. This is one of the most sustainable settlements within the area and as such, the principle of residential development within the site is acceptable. This is subject to the proposals being acceptable when assessed against other relevant material considerations, as set out below.

Design and Visual Impact

Policy DP3 (Key principles for well-designed places) of the NPPF states that development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan 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.

Policy 3 of the Local Plan accords with the provisions of Section 14 of the NPPF, 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.

As set out previously, there is a mixture of housing types and plots on Stonegate; however, most of the dwellings are located nearer to the road frontage than 26 Stonegate which is set back by approximately 21m. 26 Stonegate is also set within a larger plot than the nearest dwellings within the street scene and as such, its character and appearance differs.

The proposed dwelling would be located to the south-west of the existing dwelling within the site. Therefore, the dwelling would be located to the side and the rear of the existing dwelling. The main part of the dwelling would measure 16m by 6.8m, with a gable end roof form measuring 8.6m in height up to the ridgeline. A two-storey side projection is proposed which would also feature a gable end roof form, measuring 7.9m in height up to the ridgeline.

The dwelling would feature a relatively contemporary character, with large, glazed windows on the front elevation and an off-centre dormer window featuring a flat roof form. The proposed materials include Tibra Multi brickwork, dark grey Sandtoft Calederdale roof tiles, and planed red Grandis Eucalyptus vertical timber boarding. The windows, soffits, fascias and rainwater goods are proposed to be anthracite grey.

The proposed dwelling would comprise a two-storey dwelling of a similar scale to the existing dwelling within the site. There is no strict uniformity in terms of the existing street scene on Stonegate and there is considered to be a mixture of housing types and characters within the area. Whilst the proposed dwelling would feature a more contemporary character than many of the nearest dwellings, the proposed dwelling would be set back within the site, reducing its visual prominence within the street scene. As such, the dwelling would be seen within its individual context.

The building line along Stonegate varies to an extent and there are some nearby examples of backland development, as identified within the submitted 'Context and Justification' document. More importantly, the site itself differs significantly from the existing pattern of development along the street scene as the existing dwelling to the north (26 Stonegate) is set within a much larger plot than the nearest dwellings on Stonegate. As such, the site already differs greatly from the existing pattern of development, and it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would disrupt the building pattern along the street scene.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 14 of the NPPF.

Impact on Amenity

Policy P3 (Living conditions and pollution) of the NPPF sets out that development should provide healthy living conditions for occupiers and users in terms of adequate access to light and avoiding

exposure to levels of air, noise, artificial light or other sources of pollution. The policy also sets out that proposals should not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site.

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

It is considered that sufficient internal living space and external amenity space would be provided for future occupants of the dwelling.

The proposals would result in the subdivision of the existing plot; however, 26 Stonegate would still retain ample garden space. Some windows are proposed on the northern side elevation of the dwelling which would face towards the rear garden of 26 Stone Gate. There would be approximately 3m between these windows and the new boundary with 26 Stone Gate which is considered to be an insufficient separation distance; however, obscure glazing is proposed for these windows which should help prevent an unacceptable degree of overlooking. Obscure glazing is shown within the submitted elevation plans and this can also be secured via a planning condition. As such, it is not considered that the proposals would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking with 26 Stonegate.

The submitted Sunlight and Shadow Study shows the relationship between the site and surrounding properties. Having reviewed this information, it is considered that the proposals would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings and would not result in an unacceptable loss of daylight.

It is considered that there would be suitable separation distances between the proposed dwelling and the other nearest dwellings. For example, the distance between the rear elevation of the dwelling and the rear boundary of the site would be approximately 12m and the distance between the rear elevation of the dwelling and the rear elevations of the nearest dwellings to the south-west of the site would be approximately 21m. This is a suitable separation distance as 21m is generally accepted as a suitable amount of space to prevent an unacceptable degree of overlooking between facing habitable rooms.

There is approximately 20m between the front of the dwelling and 27 Stonegate and as such, it is considered that there would be an acceptable relationship between the proposed dwelling and the dwellings to the south-east.

Therefore, the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings or future occupants. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with the provisions of the Policy P3 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan.

Highway Safety and Parking

Policy TR6 (Assessing transport impacts) of the NPPF sets out that development proposals should only be refused on highways grounds if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety; taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan sets out 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 sets out 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 36 and Appendix 6 of the Local Plan, set out minimum vehicle parking standards. The standards require at least two spaces for dwellings of up to three bedrooms, and three spaces for dwellings with four or more bedrooms.

It is proposed for the dwelling to share a vehicular access with 26 Stonegate via the existing access within the site. The existing driveway is proposed to be expanded upon in order to extend up to the proposed dwelling towards the rear of the site. It is considered that there is sufficient room for parking and turning within the site for both the existing dwelling and the proposed dwelling.

Furthermore, Lincolnshire County Council's Highways Team have not raised any objections to the proposals.

Therefore, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of highway safety in accordance with Policies 2, 3 and 36 of the Local Plan, and Section 15 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk

Section 18 of the NPPF sets out guidance relating to how local authorities should assess and determine applications which are subject to flood risk concerns.

Policy 4 of the Local Plan allows for certain types of development within Flood Zones 2 and 3 in instances where specific criteria are met.

The site lies within Flood Zone 3, as identified within the Environment Agency's Flood Maps. Policy 4 of the Local Plan sets out that development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will be permitted in instances where specific criteria is met.

The proposed development is classed as a 'more vulnerable' use, according to Annex F of the NPPF and as such, the development is required to pass the sequential and exception tests.

The NPPF requires the application of a sequential test to ensure that new development is in areas with the lowest probability of flooding.

Paragraph 8.3.6 of the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) sets out that the search area for the sequential test should be the whole of the council area unless the functional requirements of the development justify a reduced search area. Notwithstanding this, National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) sets out that the sequential test should be applied proportionately, and the search area should always be appropriate to the nature and scale of the proposal (Paragraph 027a Reference ID:7-027a-20220825). The NPPG also sets out the following:

Paragraph 27: *"In applying paragraph 175 a proportionate approach should be taken. Where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates clearly that the proposed layout, design, and mitigation measures would ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development (therefore addressing the risks identified e.g. by Environment Agency flood risk mapping), without increasing flood risk elsewhere, then the sequential test need not be applied."*

Paragraph 27a: *"For a non-major housing development, it would not usually be appropriate for the area of search to extend beyond the specific area of a town or city in which the proposal is located, or beyond an individual village and its immediate neighbouring settlements."*

In this case, the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) does not contain a site search exercise and as such, the FRA is considered to be insufficiently detailed. Notwithstanding this, it is recognised that the vast majority of the area within and around Spalding is located within Flood Zone 3 and as such, there are not considered to be any sequentially preferable sites within Flood Zones 1 or 2 within Spalding. Therefore, in this case, it is considered that the sequential test is passed.

In terms of the exceptions test, Policy F6 (Development in areas at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea) of the NPPF requires the following criteria to be met:

- i. Provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk;*
- ii. Be safe for its anticipated lifetime in accordance with policy F7; and*
- iii. Not increase flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, reduce flood risk overall."*

In terms of part i, National Planning Guidance sets out that examples of wider sustainability benefits can include the re-use of brownfield land and the provision of sustainable drainage systems (Paragraph: 036 Reference ID: 7-036-20220825). The application form and submitted site plan appear to indicate that the proposed means of surface water drainage is via soakaways. It is unclear if this is feasible at this stage due to the lack of submitted information. Therefore, it would be appropriate to include a condition requiring further drainage details to be provided. An alternative drainage strategy would only be permitted if it was demonstrated that a sustainable drainage strategy was infeasible. For example, if the ground conditions were not suitable for soakaway

infiltration.

In terms of part ii, the SFRA sets out at Paragraph 9.1.5, that there are a range of factors to be considered when determining whether or not a development is 'safe'. The 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. Within the SFRA, areas across South Holland have been identified according to the level of hazard that is posed in terms of flood risk. Appendix C of the SFRA sets out guidance in terms of the minimum measures that are required according to what hazard category areas fall under. The site is within a 'Danger to All' hazard rating area and as such, it has been necessary to consult the Environment Agency regarding the proposals in accordance with the recommendations outlined within the SFRA. The Environment Agency has suggested compliance conditions to ensure the proposals are carried out in accordance with the submitted information and to prevent any future extensions which might provide habitable accommodation. With the inclusion of such conditions, it is considered that the proposals would meet the requirements of part ii.

In terms of part iii, soakaways are proposed as a means of managing surface water runoff from the development and this would assist with reducing the potential for the development to increase flood risk elsewhere. For example, any additional surface water runoff from the proposals should be able to be managed appropriately.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposal passes the exception test and overall, the proposal accords with Policy 4 of the Local Plan and the intentions of the NPPF in terms of flood risk.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021) requires developers to deliver a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) using standardized biodiversity units measured by statutory biodiversity metrics. This is often referred to as the mandatory requirements for Biodiversity Net Gain.

"Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, subject to some exceptions, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met ("the biodiversity gain condition"). This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. This increase can be achieved through onsite biodiversity gains, registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits".

The biodiversity gain condition is a pre-commencement condition. This relates to a condition that seeks, once planning permission has been granted, a Biodiversity Gain Plan that must be submitted and approved by the planning authority before commencement of the development, alongside the need to submit a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan.

The effect of Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the "biodiversity gain condition".

The effect of this "biodiversity gain condition" is that development granted by this notice must not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan, or
- (c) the development is exempt from the biodiversity gain condition.

In this case, the site area is under 0.2 ha and it is not considered that there is any priority habitat within the site. As such, the proposal is considered to be exempt from the requirement to provide BNG.

The submitted plans show two bird boxes and two bat boxes which would provide a form of habitat in accordance with Policy 28 of the Local Plan and Policy N2 of the NPPF. The implementation of these measures can also be secured via a condition.

The council's ecology officer has also set out that there could be habitats within the site that have the potential to support nesting birds and as such, a condition has been recommended to set out that works should not take place within the main nesting season (March to August) unless a suitably qualified ecologist has performed a breeding bird survey and appropriate measures are proposed to

protect any birds that are found. Whilst the suggested condition has been considered, it was noted during a site visit that was undertaken that the site contains limited vegetation including mature trees. There is a small hedgerow located within the site and some vegetation along the site boundaries; however, due to the overall lack of vegetation, it is considered appropriate to instead include an informative referencing the need to consider and protect nesting birds and the relevant legislation that applies as this is covered outside the planning system (the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981).

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 proposed development is appropriate and would not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality. The development is acceptable in terms of highway safety and flood risk management. Overall, the proposed development accords with the Local Plan and the NPPF. Therefore, the planning balance is in favour of the proposals.

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, 10, 11, 17, 28, 30 and 36 (including Appendix 6) of the Local Plan, along with the identified sections contained within the NPPF. 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.