DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H16-0790-26**	**Applicant:**	**Miss K Valetova**
Proposal:	Proposed ground floor side extension		
Location:	56 Chestnut Avenue Spalding		
Terminal Date:	15th 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
33	Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework August 2026

Section 4 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 14 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 15 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 17 - Pollution, public protection and security
Section 18 - Managing flood risk and coastal change

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a householder application for the erection of a side extension at 56 Chestnut Avenue, Spalding. The extension would project from the south-west elevation, to the front of an existing flat roof element. It would measure approximately 4.2m in depth (4.5m when overhang is considered) by 3.35m in width. It would have an eaves height of approximately 3.4m (approximately 100mm lower than the eaves of the flat roof section), with a mono-pitch roof at an apex of 5m.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Spalding, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. It is located towards the east of the settlement, between the Coronation Channel and the river Welland. The wider area is residential in nature.

56 Chestnut Avenue is a corner plot, located at the junction of Chestnut Avenue and Acacia Avenue. It is a two-storey, red brick, semi-detached dwellinghouse. The dwelling is typical of the area, which is dominated by post war, semi-detached dwellings.

Relevant History

No relevant history

Consultation Responses

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

Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority

This proposal is for proposed first floor side extension and the access and parking arrangements remain unchanged; therefore, it is considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Public Representations

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

Key Planning Considerations

Evaluation

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

The adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, 2026 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Principle of Development

Policy 1 of the SELLP sets out the settlement hierarchy in respect of delivering sustainable development, which meets the social and economic needs of the area whilst protecting and enhancing the environment; in order to provide enough choice of land for housing to satisfy local need, whilst making more sustainable use of land, and to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural plots by developing in sustainable locations and at appropriate densities.

Policy 1 expresses this sustainable hierarchy of settlements, ranking the settlements deemed to be most sustainable in descending order. The most sustainable locations for development are situated

within the 'Sub-Regional Centres', followed by 'Main Service Centres'. Lower down the hierarchy are areas of limited development opportunity including Minor Service Centres, with areas of development constraint comprising 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. The countryside is at the bottom of the settlement hierarchy and represents the least sustainable location.

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

Policy S4 of the NPPF outlines when development within settlements would be acceptable. This states:
"Development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework."

As the site is within Spalding, development within this location is considered appropriate. In any event, the proposal solely relates to the extension of an existing and established residential dwelling and therefore, the principle of such development is considered to be appropriate.

As such, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the requirements of the SELLP and NPPF when viewed in principle. This is subject to the assessment against site specific criteria; including (but not limited to) the impact of the proposal on the character or appearance of the area, impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers, and impact on highway safety, which are discussed in turn in the following sections.

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

Section 14 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", outlines that planning decisions and policies should "promote high quality, healthy, inclusive and sustainable places".

Paragraph 1 of DP3 outlines 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".

In order to create well-designed places, Paragraph 2 outlines that proposals should reflect seven key principles, as appropriate to the nature of the development and its location. These are: liveability, climate, nature, movement, built form, public space, and identity.

Paragraph 3 of DP3 is explicit that proposals which conflict with paragraph 1, the relevant aspects of paragraph 2 of DP3, or relevant development plan policies and guidance, should be refused. Conversely, substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.

Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP outlines sustainable development considerations for proposals; providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals. Furthermore, Policy 3 of the SELLP requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

These policies accord with the provisions of the NPPF and require that design which is inappropriate to the local area, or which fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area, will not be acceptable. Proposals for new development would therefore require the aforementioned considerations to be adequately assessed and designed, including the siting, design, and scale to be respectful of surrounding development and ensure that the character of the area is not compromised.

The extension would be located within a prominent section of the building, which faces towards Chestnut Avenue. It is clearly visible from the nearby crossroads as well due to the orientation of the dwelling. As a result, the impacts of any development would be more acutely felt.

The extension is unusual. The eaves height being set slightly below the existing flat roof, which would not be impacted by the works, would reduce the integration of the extension. Likewise, the

sharp roof pitch and its relatively significant height would be unusual in this setting. The design fails to reflect the existing features on the site, further lessening the integration of the extension.

That being said, the works would not appear so incongruous as to be immediately harmful. The use of materials to match the host would help to integrate the works to a certain extent. Moreover, the age of the property and the wider estate means that less conventional extensions and alterations are already present in the wider area. This shows a greater acceptance of unconventional features, which would help to naturalise the extension to a certain extent.

As a result, whilst the proposal is not overly well integrated into the host, it is not immediately harmful to the character or appearance of the area. The scale is commensurate to the plot, and is broadly in keeping with the wider area. As a result, it is not considered that the proposal would fail the requirements of Policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Taking account of the design, scale, and nature of the development, as detailed above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable. The proposal would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area and would therefore be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP and Section 14 of the NPPF.

Impacts Upon Resident Amenity

DP3 of the NPPF outlines that development should create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a focus on promoting liveability.

Likewise, Policy P3(1) outlines that development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site. This point is expanded upon in P3(2) which states all development proposals 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 which could have an unacceptable adverse effect on health and the quality of life ".

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

The proposal is for a ground floor extension, preventing overlooking. The orientation would prevent a harmful overshadowing effect.

As detailed above, the scale and design of the proposal is considered to have no significant or unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties or land users, when also taking account of the conditions recommended. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Sections 14 and 17 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan in terms of impact upon residential amenity.

Highway Safety and Parking

Section 15 of the NPPF is titled 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Within this, Policy TR6(4) advises that "development proposals should be refused 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. This applies both during the construction phase and following completion."

In respect of highway matters, Policy 2 details that proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to access and vehicle generation. Policy 3 details that development proposals will demonstrate how accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways will be secured, where they are relevant to the proposal. Policy 33 further reinforces the need for developments to be accessible via sustainable modes of transport.

Policy 36 of the SELLP, in conjunction with Appendix 6, sets out minimum vehicle parking standards and requires at least two spaces for dwellings of up to three bedrooms and three spaces for dwellings with four or more bedrooms.

The proposal would not effect parking or access arrangements.

The proposal would therefore be acceptable and would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety in accordance with Policies 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Section 15 of the NPPF.

Flooding Considerations

Section 18 of the NPPF relates to "Managing flood risk and coastal change". It requires a sequential approach to flood risk, in accordance with the decision making policies contained within this section. Policy F7 is clear that "development proposals should not present a risk from flooding to potential occupiers, users, or visitors, and should not increase flood risk elsewhere."

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

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

NPPF Policy F5(3) states "the strategic flood risk assessment covering the area of the proposed development and the Flood Map for Planning should provide the evidential basis for applying the sequential test". It is worth noting that large parts of the district of South Holland lie within Flood Zone 3. It is therefore necessary to use the refined flood risk information (Hazard and Depth maps) within the SFRA as a basis to apply the sequential test.

Within the SFRA the site is classed as danger for all, with a hazard depth of 2m.

Whilst the onsite flood risk is noted, Policy F5(2) states:
"The sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, other than for - householder development".
Expanding upon this, NPPF Policy F6(2) states: "The exception test does not need to be applied: To those forms of development, or in those circumstances, where the sequential test is not required, as set out in policy F5"

Therefore, in line with Policy F5(2)(ci) and F6(2)(a), there is no need to apply the exceptions or sequential tests. In any event, the proposal would not increase the vulnerability of the use to flooding, or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

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

Planning Balance

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

The proposal represents appropriate development within the defined settlement boundary. The development hereby proposed does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or amenity of nearby residents, and provides adequate parking, whilst conforming with the SELLP and the provisions of the NPPF when viewed as a whole.

Whilst the design is unorthodox, it is not considered that it would be overly harmful. On that basis, it is not considered that the harms of the proposal would substantially outweigh the benefits, and therefore Policy S4 of the NPPF has been met and the proposal should be approved.

Additional Considerations

Public Sector Equality Duty

In making this decision the Authority must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act. This means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in discharging its functions) to:
A. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act
B. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. This may include removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the special needs of those with a protected characteristic; encouraging participation in public life (or other areas where they are underrepresented) of people with a protected characteristic(s).
C. Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

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

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

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

Human Rights

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

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

Conclusion

Taking these factors into consideration, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 33, and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 4, 14, 15, 17 and 18 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the benefits of the proposal; therefore, the planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

Recommendation

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