DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H16-0849-26**	**Applicant:**	**V Chapman**
Proposal:	Proposed first floor side extension		
Location:	75 Aintree Drive Spalding		
Terminal Date:	2nd November 2026		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

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

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a householder application for a first floor side extension at 75 Aintree Drive, Spalding. The extension would be located above an existing flat-roof garage, with the same width and depth as

this feature (approximately 2785mm and 8385mm respectively). The eaves and ridge height would match the host, at approximately 4800mm and 6260mm respectively. The extension would feature a hipped roof. All materials would match the host.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Spalding, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The dwelling is located towards the south of the settlement, within a late 20th century housing estate. The river Welland is approximately 140m east of the site.

75 Aintree Drive is fairly typical of the area, being a two-storey, red brick dwelling. It is comprised of a gable ended, two-storey section, with recessed northern side, and a single-storey flat roof garage to the north. Whilst the dwellings in the area are all from a similar period, there is a good variety of house types and designs.

Relevant History

No 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

The proposal is for proposed first floor side extension and it does not have an adverse impact on the Public Highway.

Cllr Ashby

"I have seen this design before around Spalding fine with me"

The same comment was received three times

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 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.

As previously outlined, there is a variety of dwelling designs in the area. Therefore, whilst the flat roof garage present on this dwelling is typical of the area, it is not ubiquitous. There are several

properties, including the three dwellings to the immediate north, which do not have this feature, and instead have a full length two-storey core. Therefore, the design would not be unusual in the area, and would broadly replicate features which are already present within the locale. This repetition of existing features would help to naturalise the extension.

The design is well integrated into the host. The continuation of the eaves and ridge heights would help integrate the extension, making it appear as a natural addition to the host. The use of materials to match the host furthers this point.

The scale of the resultant dwelling would be commensurate to the scale of the plot. Likewise, it would broadly be consistent with the scale of dwellings within the wider area.

As a result of these factors, the design would be well integrated into the host and the wider area. It would not appear immediately incongruous or harmful to the area.

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.

Any additional shadow would fall primarily on a blank elevation and paved area to the south side of number 73. As a result, any shadow cast would not result in a significant or harmful amenity impact. The proposed windows to the front would look onto the public realm. The rear facing window would offer no more intrusive views than what is currently available to residents. As a result, there would be no additional harmful 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.

Adequate on site parking has been retained. There would be no alteration to the access arrangements to the site. As a result, there would be no negative highway or parking implications.

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.

Planning Balance

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

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

Additional Considerations

Public Sector Equality Duty

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

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

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

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

Human Rights

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

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

Conclusion

Taking these factors into consideration, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 4, 14, 15, and 17 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.