

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H20-1228-25 **Applicant:** Mr Roffe
Proposal: Demolition of existing barn & erection of one dwelling
Location: Ivy House Farm Sutton Road Sutton St James
Terminal Date: 11th February 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
29	The Historic Environment
30	Pollution
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	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	2

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The proposal seeks full planning permission for the demolition of a barn and the erection of a two-storey dwelling with a gable end roof form. The dwelling is proposed to be accessed from Sutton Road with a front driveway and a garden area around the dwelling.

Site Description

The application site comprises land at Ivy House Farm, which is located to the north-west of Sutton Road, approximately 600m to the north-east of Sutton St James. The site forms part of a farmyard and the site itself contains one agricultural building. The site is mostly surrounded by agricultural fields; however, there are equestrian facilities and a residential caravan approximately 150m to the south of the site, on the opposite side of Sutton Road. There are also dwellings located to the north-east of the site, the nearest being Holland House and Home Farm.

The site is outside of any defined settlement boundaries, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 and accompanying policies map.

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

Planning History

Application Site:

H20-0833-24: (Prior Approval Application) Conversion of agricultural building to dwelling - approved 25 November 2024

H20-0293-25: (Full Application) Demolition of existing barn & erection of one dwelling & garage - refused 04 August 2025

Land to the South-West (Within Applicant's Ownership):

H20-0688-22: (Full Application) Proposed new dwelling for agricultural worker - refused 14 November 2023

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.

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

location.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: Sufficient visibility is provided at this location to allow drivers to judge if it is safe to complete the manoeuvre and enter the highway. Adequate provision for car parking and turning space can be provided within the limits of the site to enable vehicles to enter and leave in a forward gear and therefore, it is considered that this proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact upon highway safety. That said, the existing vehicle access is not appropriate for this or current use as it is just an unbound material and therefore, it will need to be made up to the County Councils specification within the extent of the public highway appropriate for its proposed residential use. Highway informative 03 and 08 are recommended.

Lincolnshire County Council - Historic Environment Team: 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.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board:

Byelaw 3 (Surface Water): The Flood Risk Assessment (lodged 16/12/25) recommends surface water disposal to soakaway (infiltration) but we cannot see that the viability of this proposal has been evidenced. As per the FRA we also advocate that ground investigation should be 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. Under this scenario the Board's previous written consent would be required under Byelaw 3. The Board recommends 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 2l/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 treat foul waste using a package treatment plant, however we cannot see how they intend to dispose of treated foul water from this development. It would be helpful if the applicant could indicate the likely position of the package plant on a revised site plan. If the applicant proposes to discharge treated foul water to a watercourse, consent would be required under Byelaw 3. Kindly note that any consent granted for the discharge of treated foul water is likely to be subject to a Treated Foul Water Development Contribution fee (TFWDC) as outlined within our Development Control Charges and Fees.

Section 23, Land Drainage Act 1991: We note the presence of a watercourse which is not maintained by the Board (a riparian watercourse, marked 'Drain' on the site plan) adjacent to the north-eastern site boundary. Within the applicant's Design and Access Statement, it is stated that the existing site access will be upgraded to Highways specification. It is possible that there may be an historic piped watercourse (culvert) at the site entrance. Any proposal to alter an existing culvert, or to widen the entrance by extending across the existing open Drain with a culvert, would require the Board's previous written consent under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and Byelaw 4).

Byelaw 10 (No Works within 9 metres of the Edge of Drainage / Flood Risk Management Infrastructure): Whilst outside the direct scope of this proposed development, we are taking the opportunity to highlight the presence of two Board maintained arterial watercourses adjacent to the wider site boundary outlined blue, these being G06 Childersgate Drain Branch (drain code DRN198P0601) located at the western site boundary and H38 South Holland Main Drain (drain code DR199G3804) to the north. The applicant is reminded that any works within 9 metres of the edge of a Board arterial watercourse require the Board's previous written consent under Byelaw 10. Likely acceptable works are summarised in the Board's Planning and Byelaw Strategy (see annex). Also, should the applicant seek to alter either watercourse then Section 23/Byelaw 4 requirements would also need to be met (see above). would the applicant not currently proposed, should the applicant's proposals change to include works to alter the watercourse, or if works are proposed to alter the watercourse at any time in the future, consent would also be required under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and Byelaw 4).

Ecology Officer: The proposal is exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain. We support all mitigation and enhancement recommendations provided in the PEA and request they be set as a condition at

discharge. We believe this application will require a protected species survey (specifically barn owls) to be provided pre-determination. It is important that the protected species survey is provided to help identify and evaluate any features of ecological interest on/adjacent to a proposed development site, and identify any potential mitigation measures required in line with the exiting wildlife legislation and planning policies. We believe that this site has suitable nesting habitat for birds. Therefore, we request a condition requiring that works should not be carried out in the main nesting season (March 1st - August 31st).

Sutton St James Parish Council: No response received.

Cllr L J Eldridge: No response received.

Lincolnshire Bat Group: 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 have been received from members of the public.

Key Planning Considerations

Development Plan

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) 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

Paragraph 84 of the NPPF sets out that planning decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:

- "a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;*
- b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;*
- c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;*
- d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or*
- e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
i. is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
ii. would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics*

of the local area."

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 outside any defined settlement boundary. The nearest settlement to the site is Sutton St James, for which the settlement boundary is approximately 600m to the south-west of the site. Therefore, the site is within the countryside in planning policy terms. Part D of Policy 1 sets out that within the countryside, development will be permitted that is necessary to such a location and / or where it can be demonstrated that it meets the sustainable development needs of the area in terms of economic, community or environmental benefits.

It has not been demonstrated that residential development is necessary in this location; for example, in conjunction with agriculture or other rural based business. Moreover, the site is physically divorced from Sutton St James and larger service settlements such as Gedney Hill, Holbeach and Spalding. In the absence of footways and given the distances involved it would be difficult to access these settlements for the day to day needs of the occupants without use of a private car. Therefore, the proposal does not accord with Policy 1 and would not normally be considered a suitable site for new housing.

The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, within which the section entitled 'Planning Principle' sets out the proposed justification for the dwelling. Reference is made to application H06-1043-21 which relates to another site in Gedney. It is presumed that the statement meant to refer to Class Q approval H20-0833-24 which relates to the current site. The statement sets out that the applicant considers that the proposed development represents a 'betterment' compared to the Class Q approval.

Caselaw has demonstrated that Class Q consents are a legitimate fallback position when considering alternative proposals for development of the same site. The relevant legal principles relating to fallback were set out in *R v Secretary of State for the Environment and Havering BC (1998) EnvLR189*. In that case Mr Lockhart-Mummery QC, sitting as a Deputy High Court Judge, accepted submissions that there were three elements to the fallback test:

"First whether there is a fallback use, that is to say whether there is a lawful ability to undertake such a use; secondly, whether there is a likelihood or real prospect of such occurring. Thirdly, if the answer to the second question is "yes", a comparison must be made between the proposed development and the fallback use."

The notion of the Class Q fallback position was also comprehensively dealt with at the landmark Court of Appeal case, *Mansell vs Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council (2017)*. This case established that that where there is demonstrably a realistic prospect of a permitted development scheme being implemented, and where an alternative proposal would normally conflict with the development plan insofar as it being an unsuitable location for housing, the potential for the fallback position to outweigh that conflict must be considered by the LPA. Therefore, where the alternative new-build proposal offers either an enhancement to the setting or a reduction in density when compared to the fallback, the development could be allowed to proceed.

The LPA considers that there is a realistic prospect that the Class Q conversion could take place. Consent has recently been granted, and the developer has three years to complete the development. Therefore, it is necessary to consider if the current proposals offer either an enhancement to the setting or a reduction in density when compared to the fallback position. This is discussed within the remainder of this report.

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 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.

The application seeks consent for a two-storey detached dwelling, with a single storey side element and a two-storey rear projection. The dwelling is proposed to feature a gable end roof form with chimney breasts on either end of the main part of the dwelling.

The Design and Access Statement sets out that the proposed design has taken inspiration from the nearest dwellings to the site, Holland House and Home Farm, which are located to the north-east. There are some similarities between the proposed dwelling and these dwellings such as the scale of the dwelling and the brickwork facades.

The proposed dwelling is much smaller than the dwelling that was refused under application H20-0293-25. A simpler and more traditional building form is proposed compared to the refused design which contained multiple elements and roof heights. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling would be located partly within the building footprint of the existing barn building, whereas the previously refused dwelling was proposed to be located further to the north-west and included a much larger residential curtilage.

The external materials of the dwelling are not indicated within the submitted plans and the application form only indicates basic details such as the proposed use of facing brickwork, roof slates and uPVC and aluminium windows and doors. As such, it would be appropriate to secure further details of the proposed materials via a planning condition.

A garden area is proposed around the dwelling which is considered to be proportionate to the dwelling. The garden size has been reduced compared with the previously refused application. Hedgerow planting is proposed to enclose the garden area, providing a degree of screening and soft landscaping. As the proposal seeks to extend further into the countryside than previously approved, it would be appropriate to limit certain permitted development rights for dwellings, in the interests of visual amenity.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal represents a betterment over the previously approved scheme for the site. As such, the proposed development 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 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 dwellings are located approximately 120m to the north-east of the site and there is a residential caravan located approximately 150m to the south of the site, on the opposite side of Sutton Road. There are no dwellings next to the site and as such, the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact on any neighbouring dwellings.

Ample indoor living space and outdoor amenity space is proposed for the dwelling to allow for a good standard of living for future occupants.

The proposed development would result in an acceptable impact on the residential amenity of nearby dwellings and future occupants. Therefore, 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 use the existing access point from Sutton Road to the south-east of the site. The existing access is unsurfaced and the site plan indicates that the access will be upgraded to LCC's specification. Lincolnshire County Council's (LCC's) highways team agree that the access will need upgrading to LCC's specification and have not raised any other concerns with the proposals. There is considered to be adequate room for parking and turning within the site.

Therefore, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of highway safety in accordance 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 allows for certain types of development within Flood Zones 2 and 3 in instances where specific criteria are met.

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."*

Whilst a district-wide search would typically be required as the proposal is located within the countryside, it is recognised that there is fallback position in this case that would allow for the creation of a dwelling within the site if the prior approval consent was implemented and completed. As such, it is considered that the sequential test is passed in this instance.

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 proposal would provide a dwelling which would provide a moderate contribution to the district's housing land supply. Soakaways are recognised in the NPPG as a potential sustainable benefit. Whilst soakaways are proposed within the submission, the use of soakaways could be secured by a condition. The proposals would also reduce some of the built footprint within the site compared with the prior approval consent which could assist with managing surface water run-off within the site.

In terms of part b, 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. The site is not within an identified hazard area as identified by the SFRA. As such, no specific flood risk mitigation is required by the SFRA. Notwithstanding this, the submitted FRA recommends that the ground floor finished floor levels of the dwelling should be set 0.5m above the existing ground level. As such, it is considered that the exception test is passed.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development 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 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.

The application is accompanied by a BNG Exemption Statement which sets out that the applicant

considers that the proposal is exempt as the proposal is would not affect more than 25sqm of habitat. It is considered that the proposal would be exempt as the site does not comprise more than 25sqm of habitat. The LPA's ecology officer agrees that the proposal would be exempt.

The application is also accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA), which concludes that protected species surveys are not necessary as the site is unlikely to host protected species. The LPA's ecology officer agrees with the recommendations within the PEA and a condition has been recommended to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the measures outlined within the PEA. The LPA's ecology officer has set out that a barn owl survey should be undertaken prior to the determination of the application. However, the applicant's ecologist has subsequently confirmed that there was no evidence of barn owls within the site. As such, it is not considered necessary to require a protected species survey in this instance.

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.

Although the proposal conflicts with Policy 1, it is considered that the proposed development would represent a betterment in comparison with the Class Q approval. As such, it is considered that the benefits of the proposal outweigh the conflict with Policy 1 in this instance. The proposed development is also considered to be acceptable in terms of other relevant considerations such as highway safety, flood risk and ecology.

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.