DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H17-0700-25**	**Applicant:**	**Ms K Woods**
Proposal:	Proposed self-build detached single storey dwelling (Class C3) with onsite parking utilising an existing vehicular access		
Location:	Adjacent To 23 Reservoir Road Surfleet Spalding		
Terminal Date:	23rd December 2025		

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
29	The Historic Environment
30	Pollution
33	Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 4 - Decision-making
Section 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 11 - Making effective use of land
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed 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
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	1

WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
PLANNING LIAISON OFFICER - FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT	0	0	0	1
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
WELLAND AND DEEPINGS INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	2
RESIDENTS	6	0	0	2

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The proposal seeks full planning permission for the erection of a detached single storey dwelling. The dwelling is proposed as a self-build dwelling.

The dwelling is proposed to measure 10.5m by 4.8m, featuring two sloping roofs. At its tallest the dwelling would measure 5.1m in height. A glazed element is proposed above the northern roof slope that faces towards Reservoir Road. Rendered facades are proposed with a slate roof incorporating solar panels.

Site Description

The building comprises land next to the River Glen and 23 Reservoir Road. No. 23 comprises a detached single storey dwelling located to the east of the site. The site currently features some planting, including shrubs and trees and a parking space with a vehicular access from Reservoir Road.

The site is located within the settlement boundary of Surfleet 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

The following application relates to land to the east of the site, within the curtilage of 23 Reservoir Road:

H17-0852-08: (Full Application) Proposed detached single garage to front of dwelling - approved 29 September 2008

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.

Surfleet Parish Council: Some concern about entry and exit onto the carriageway, no doubt highways will have a view.

Welland and Deepings Internal Drainage Board: I recommend that the Environment Agency are consulted as soon as possible due to the site's proximity to the River Glen as they may wish to comment on this application.

Environment Agency: The proposed development will only meet the NPPF's requirements in relation to flood risk if a condition is included requiring compliance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment. The submitted FRA has identified that the predicted flood level is 4.83 metres Above Ordnance Datum (mAOD) for the 0.1% AEP plus 20% climate change flood event. The correct central climate change allowance for this site is 17% and therefore the FRA takes a slightly conservative approach. The submitted FRA proposes a finished floor level (FFL) of 5.1mAOD. The proposed FFL includes a freeboard of 0.27m. Whilst the freeboard is slightly below 0.3m, we are satisfied that the proposed FFL is acceptable, in this instance, due to a slightly conservative climate change allowance. We note that the Floor Plan and Section drawing shows a finished floor level of 5.01m which is not in line with the information contained within the FRA. We advise that this should be amended to reflect the mitigation outlined in the FRA. We support that safe refuge will be provided on a mezzanine floor at a level of 7.1 meters above Ordinance Datum (AOD).

Lincolnshire County Council - Historic Environment Officer: The proposal is unlikely to have an impact on significant archaeological remains. Consequently, no further archaeological input is necessary for this application.

Natural England: Automated response received (no objections raised).

Environmental Protection: I request a standard land contamination condition be applied at this location.

Ecology Officer: Having reviewed the PEA and BNG exemption statement for this application, please see our comments below.
·The applicant has not provided enough ecological documentation for this application.
·After completing our own LERC search we have seen that otters have been seen onsite and water vole have been seen within 250m of the site. However, within the PEA there were no mitigation or enhancement measure recommended for the site - especially for these protected species (wildlife and countryside act 1981). Therefore, we require a mitigation method statement to be provided pre-commencement with a focus on Otters and Water vole. We would also request that a document be provided pre-commencement outlining enhancement methods onsite. These could include:
oThe applicant include at least 1 universal bird and integrated bat box to be added to each dwelling to enhance the biodiversity provision on site post-development.
oWater vole habitat enhancement: Restoration and maintenance of vegetated bankside corridors to link fragmented water vole populations.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS:

First Response (04 September 2025): Dimensions of the parking space is required. The gates must open inwards or be sliding gates. I appreciate that the access exists, but I have concerns with vehicles reversing into the highway - can visibility be improved or turning provided on site.

Second Response (16 October 2025): The access to the site exists, it will be widened in accordance with the approved site layout and visibility has been demonstrated in accordance with Manual for Streets. The visibility should be conditioned to ensure that the boundary hedges are maintained. The proposal will not have an adverse effect on the public highway. Highway condition 13 and informative 08 are recommended.

Cllr S A Slade: No response received.

Cllr J Avery: No response received.

Cllr E J Sneath: No response received.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust: 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, 11 representations have been received. 3 of the representations are from the same respondent and another 3 representations are from another respondent. The following key matters are raised within the responses:

-The visibility splays for the access are unsuitable.
-The vehicular access has recently been constructed, removing a hedgerow.
-Only one parking space is proposed and this could result in the need for on-street parking which would be unsuitable.
-The plot of land is too small for a dwelling of any size let alone a dwelling with parking.
-The proposed dwelling will stand out too much when compared with other dwellings in the immediate vicinity and I feel will spoil the look of the immediate area when approaching along Reservoir Road.
-The proposed new dwelling seems rather out of character for the area. This part of Reservoir Road consists larger than average houses with substantial gardens and sufficient space to park more than one car. The proposed dwelling is of necessity going to be small and with not much in the way of a garden.
-The building is more likely to be used as an AirBnB rather than a dwelling which would be unsuitable for the area.
-Because of its size and position on a small site, the development would overshadow neighbouring homes and create an overbearing sense of enclosure. Combined with the increased traffic movements, this will negatively affect the privacy and quality of life of nearby residents.
-Environmental and Wildlife issues. The site borders the riverbank, which is an important habitat for local wildlife, including birds and other species that depend on the green corridor. Overdevelopment so close to the river risks damaging this natural environment through noise, light pollution and potential disturbance to the bank itself. Protecting this habitat is essential for maintaining biodiversity in the area.
-An existing pine tree on site has been severely butchered to make way for the new proposed building.
-Where the 2 rivers meet, this causes soil erosion, and this is where the proposed development would be. The Environment Agency have repaired this bank a couple of years ago but if the building is allowed to go ahead it will stop any future repairs being done.
-The development could affect wildlife that nest and habitat the bank.
-The site is a natural beauty spot with many walkers, cyclists and swimmers and will restrict swimmers from getting in and out of the water.
-The ownership of the site is unclear, and it appears the site might have been extended in 2021 or 2022.

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, December 2024 (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 and Visual Impact;
-Impact on Amenity;
-Highway Safety and Parking;
-Flood Risk; 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 Surfleet which is a Minor Service Centre. Policy 1 sets out that within this type of settlement, 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. Development will normally be limited to Allocated and Committed sites and infill. As the proposal is for a minor residential development, the scale of the development is acceptable in principle.

Whilst the principle of development is acceptable, it is necessary to assess the proposed development against other relevant material considerations, as set out below.

Design and Visual Impact

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area (including beyond the short term) and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

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 12 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.

Reservoir Road is characterised by a range house types set within various plot layouts and sizes. Therefore, there is no strict uniformity within the street scene. There are some detached two storey dwellings located to the north of the site, on the opposite side of Reservoir Road. The nearest dwelling is 23 Reservoir Road which is a single storey dwelling located on the southern side of Reservoir Road, next to the River Glen. The dwelling features rendered facades and vertical cladding. Further to the east, there are various properties located close to the riverbank including a range of house types.

Under the current proposal, the dwelling is proposed to measure 10.5m by 4.8m. The dwelling is proposed to feature two sloping roofs, measuring 5.1m at the tallest point. A glazed element is proposed above one of the roof slopes that faces towards Reservoir Road. The dwelling is considered to feature a contemporary appearance, including rendered facades and a large area of floor length glazing on the southern elevation. The top of the roof slopes would be set at different levels, adding to the contemporary appearance of the dwelling. Whilst the proposed roof form is not typical for the area, it is considered that the proposed roof form would add an interesting addition to

the street scene and its visual impact is considered to be acceptable.

The proposed rendered facades are considered to be in keeping with the character of the area as there are several examples of render near to the site. The dwelling is proposed to feature a slate roof with solar panels on the southern roof slope. A circular window is proposed on the western side elevation, the shape of which resembles a porthole which is considered to add interest to the appearance of the dwelling as viewed from the south.

The proposed dwelling would be taller than 23 Reservoir Road, which appears to measure approximately 3.3m in height according to the submitted 'Road Elevation' plan. Nonetheless, the dwelling would comprise a single storey structure and its scale is considered to be in keeping with the surrounding area.

Therefore, the visual impact of the development is considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that development should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; 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 Local Plan set out that residential amenity and the relationship to existing development and land uses is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

The nearest dwelling is 23 Reservoir Road, which is located to the east of the site. No windows are proposed at the ground level on the eastern side elevation of the dwelling and as such, it is not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking. Similarly, there are suitable separation distances between the proposed dwelling and the nearest dwellings. The dwelling would also not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing due to its scale and positioning.

The dwelling would feature approximately 43sqm of floorspace on the ground floor. Some additional floorspace is proposed in a mezzanine area, however, the purpose of this space is as a place of refuge if a serious flood event occurred. It is considered that sufficient internal floorspace would be provided. Sufficient external amenity space would also be proposed. The proposal would result in the reduction of garden space for 23 Reservoir Road, however, sufficient garden space would be retained for existing occupants.

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 Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan.

Highway Safety and Parking

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF sets out 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, following mitigation.

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.

The proposal seeks to retain the existing vehicular access from Reservoir Road for the proposed dwelling. Lincolnshire County Council's highways team initially requested that the dimensions of the parking space were set out within the submitted plans. The team also requested that the gates to the site open inwards or comprise sliding gate, to avoid gates opening onto the highway which could

cause a highway safety hazard. The plans have subsequently been updated, and it has been clarified that the access gates will be removed. The amended plans show that there is room for two vehicles to park within the site. The highways team have confirmed that the amended information is acceptable and have recommended highway condition 13, which would require visibility splays to be retained.

Therefore, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of highway safety and would therefore accord with Local Plan Policies 2, 3 and 36, and Section 9 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk

Section 14 of the NPPF sets out guidance relating to how local authorities should assess and determine applications which are subject to flood risk concerns.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan requires proposals to meet sustainable development considerations including in relation to sustainable drainage and flood risk (part 7).

Policy 4 of the Local Plan requires proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to be supported by sufficient information relating to flood risks associated with the development.

The proposed development is classed as a 'more vulnerable' use, according to Annex 3 of the NPPF. As the site lies within Flood Zone 3 and would comprise a more vulnerable use, the proposed development is required to pass the sequential and exception tests. The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), which contains sections relating to how the applicant considers that the proposed development passes 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 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 relation to the sequential test, the applicant's FRA sets out the following:

"Whilst it is recognised that the site is indicated as being in Flood Zone 3 on the Environment Agency Flood Map, the site specific levels demonstrate differently. Flood Zone 1 is defined as land that has less than a 0.1% annual probability (1 in 1000 chance each year) of flooding. The 0.1% annual probability (1 in 1000 chance each year) flood level is +4.31m OD and the typical ground level in the upper terrace of the site exceeds this level by more than 300mm.

The proposed new dwelling is to be built on land that meets the definition of Flood Zone 1. On this basis the site is considered to pass the Sequential Test."

Whilst the applicant considers that the site can be considered as partly within Flood Zone 1, the site is nonetheless identified within Flood Zone 3 by the Environment Agency. A settlement-wide search of Surfleet would typically be required. However, as per the above referenced guidance, if it can be demonstrated that future occupiers can remain safe and that flood risk would not increase elsewhere as a result of the proposals, the sequential test need not be applied.

In terms of the exceptions test, Paragraph 178 of the NPPF requires the following to be demonstrated:

"a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and
b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall."

In terms of part a, the development would make a contribution to local housing supply which could benefit the community as future occupants could help sustain local services and facilities. 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 indicates that the proposed means of surface water drainage is via a sustainable drainage system. 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 b, 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 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. 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 identified within not within a hazard rating area; however, the site is adjacent to a functional flood plain. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposals and have recommended a compliance condition to ensure the development accords with the NPPF. The Environment Agency has set out within their consultation response that the Floor Plan and Section plans show a finished floor level (FFL) of 5.01mAOD which does not align with the recommended FFL of 5.1m AOD within the submitted FRA. As such, the plans have been amended to ensure they are consistent with the submitted FRA. Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would meet the requirements of Paragraph 178b.

There is a lack of information relating to a district wide search for alternative sites to pass the sequential test and a lack of information to demonstrate sustainability benefits to the community. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that an appropriate level of flood risk mitigation is proposed and the development would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development. As such, it is considered that 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 applicant considers that the development is exempt from the requirement to provide BNG as the dwelling would comprise a self-build dwelling. The LPA agrees with this given that the design appears to be bespoke for the site. As such, the development is exempt from the requirement to provide BNG. A unilateral undertaken agreement has been prepared to ensure the proposal is for a self-build / custom dwelling.

The current application is accompanied by an ecological report which concludes that the site is unlikely to impact upon protected species or their habitats. The LPA's ecology officer has asked for a condition requiring further details including a mitigation method statement to be provided pre-commencement. Initially the officer requested that this statement relates to otters; however, the officer has since clarified that due to the built-up nature of the area, otter mitigation is unlikely to be feasible. The condition would still require details of water vole mitigation and bird and bat boxes. With the inclusion of such a condition, it is considered that the proposals would accord with the aims of Policy 28 of the Local Plan.

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 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. Therefore, the proposed development accords with the Local Plan and the NPPF. 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

Taking the above considerations into account, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 17, 28, 30 and 36 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.