

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H01-1012-25 **Applicant:** Mr P Fox

Proposal: Proposed single storey side extension to bungalow to form attached garage & external alterations - Retrospective

Location: 186 Barrier Bank Cowbit Spalding

Terminal Date: 27th January 2026

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

- 01 Spatial Strategy
- 02 Development Management
- 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 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
- Section 12 - Achieving well designed places

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a householder application seeking permission for a side extension and alterations at 186

Barrier Bank. The extension would form a garage measuring 5.85m (width) by 5.95m (depth). It would feature a flat roof set at 2.8m. The elevations would be rendered to match the host, the roof material would be lead coloured glass-fibre flat roof covering, and the door would be dark grey PVCU.

The front of the dwelling has been rendered white. Retrospective permission is sought for this element.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Cowbit, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The site is towards the south-east of the settlement, along Barrier Bank, the former main road connecting Spalding to Crowland. To the east is residential dwellings, and the settlement's bulk, to the west is agricultural land.

186 Barrier Bank is a reasonably large bungalow, constructed in the late 20th century. The dwelling is emblematic of the area, albeit at a grander scale.

Relevant History

H01-0407-91 - Full - Extension to dwelling - approved 07/06/91.

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

No objections - "The proposal is for single storey side extension to bungalow to form attached garage. There is sufficient space for parking on the property and the access will remain unchanged. It will not have an adverse effect on the public highway."

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, 2024 (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 Cowbit which is classed as minor service centre within Policy 1. As such development will be permitted that supports Cowbit's role as a service centre, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities.

As the site is within Cowbit, 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 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 12 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", states that the "creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve" and as such, it is generally accepted that good design plays a key role towards sustainable development.

Paragraph 135, contained within Section 12 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. This goes on to establish that it is important that new development should be of the highest quality, to enhance and reinforce good design characteristics, and that decisions must have regard towards the impact that the proposed development would have on local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting such as topography, street patterns, building lines, boundary treatment and through scale and massing. Developments 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, among other considerations.

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.

An existing flat roof garage, albeit at a smaller scale, exists on site. To a certain extent, this feature would help to naturalise this proposal, as it shows an acceptance for this built form.

Whilst not overly visually appealing, the design is typical, preventing it from appearing immediately alien or harmful. Several dwellings in the locale feature comparable extensions, which would help to naturalise the proposal further. The roof height, in comparison to the eaves of the host, does sit somewhat awkwardly; however, not to such an extent as to be immediately noticeable or significantly detrimental.

The use of materials to match the host would help to ensure further integration of design. The use of render is not uncommon in the area, with several nearby dwellings using the same material. On this basis, the addition here would not appear incongruous.

Likewise, the rendering of the dwelling itself is considered to be acceptable. The use of render across a whole dwelling is not uncommon in the wider area, and therefore, the addition here is considered acceptable. The changes to the fenestration are also considered to be acceptable, amounting to a minor alteration which would not fundamentally alter the appearance of the dwellinghouse.

On balance, whilst the design is not of any significant merit, it is representative of existing design choices in the area. As a result, the proposal would not appear harmful to the character of the area and so may be considered acceptable.

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 12 of the NPPF.

Impacts Upon Resident 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.

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.

Whilst the garage would run immediately to the boundary line, the level of overshadowing would be low due to the low lying nature of the proposal. Moreover, any shadow cast would fall upon the driveway of the adjacent house, reducing the tangible impacts.

As no windows are proposed, no overlooking would occur.

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 Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan in terms of impact upon residential amenity.

Highway Safety and Parking

Section 9 of the NPPF is titled 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Within this, Paragraph 116 advises 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, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios".

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 help to meet parking needs of the site, while still providing enough room for vehicles to manoeuvre. The proposal would have no significant detrimental impact upon the highway network.

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 9 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 9 and 12 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.