

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H18-0441-26 **Applicant:** Sis Pitches

Proposal: Details of surface water drainage strategy (Condition 6 of H18-1242-25)

Location: Sutton Bridge Memorial Park Sutton Bridge Spalding

Terminal Date: 2nd July 2026

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02 Development Management
03 Design of New Development
04 Approach to Flood Risk

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a discharge of conditions application providing details of surface water drainage strategy (Condition 6 of H18-1242-25).

Site Description

This area of Memorial Park is located within allocated recreational open space, as well as within flood zone 3 in accordance with Environment Agencies Mapping Systems. The proposal seeks to site the MUGA close to existing playing pitches.

There is a TPO in the area and whilst the MUGA is located away from the root protection area, a proposed drainage strategy runs through it.

The Curlew Centre is accessed from Bridge Road, car parking exists to both the front and rear of the building. A play area is located to the east of the Memorial Park.

History

H18-1242-25 - Construction of new MUGA playzone for football basketball and netball with associated fencing and lighting. Approved 11-02-26

Consultation Responses

Highways/Duds

No objections - Having given due regard to the appropriate local and national planning policy guidance (in particular the National Planning Policy Framework), Lincolnshire County Council (as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority) has concluded that the proposed development would not be expected to have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety or a severe residual cumulative impact upon the local highway network or increase surface water flood risk and therefore does not wish to object to this planning application.

IDB

We are pleased to see that a drainage strategy reliant on infiltration is likely to be achievable on the proposed development. We note that the drawing 'Proposed Site Plan' (1457.2-A-(08)02_Rev A01, SIS Pitches, 10/11/25) and the wording within Section 2.3.1 of the Surface Water Strategy (R-00360- 001-SWS-0, SEA Consulting Engineers, April 2026) suggests that surface water will connect to the existing drainage system to the north of the development site. However, Sections 2.2.5, 2.3.3 and the drawing 'Proposed Drainage Layout' (00360/E02, SEA Consulting Engineers, 22.04.2026), within the same Surface Water Strategy document suggest a new soakaway will be installed to the west of the pitch.

Tree Officer

No comments received.

Planning Considerations

Condition 6 - Surface Water Drainage Strategy

The condition requires:

Notwithstanding the approved site plan (ref: 1457.2-A-(08)02_Rev A01), prior to the first use of the MUGA hereby approved a detailed surface water drainage strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the drainage scheme so approved and shall thereafter be retained.

The applicant has provided the following:

- Surface Water Drainage Strategy (SEA Consulting Engineers)

It is proposed to restrict the surface water flow from the pitch prior to out falling to a new soakaway. Surface water would be managed through a combination of sub-base attenuation, flow control and a new soakaway designed in accordance with current climate change allowances. Modelling indicates the system adequately manages runoff up to the 1 in 30-year event, with exceedance flows during the 1 in 100-year plus 40% climate change event contained safely within the site, thereby avoiding increased flood risk elsewhere. The drain route on plan shows that the infrastructure traverse the west side of the protected tree. The route shows it will be located outside its canopy.

The tree officer has been consulted but has not made any comments. Highways and the IDB do not object

All new surface water will remain private, and maintenance will be the responsibility of the landowner. The following maintenance plan shall be implemented.

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

Condition 6 of H18-1242-25 are hereby discharged.