DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H01-1233-25**	**Applicant:**	**Mr A Schneider**
Proposal:	Proposed single storey front & rear extensions		
Location:	The Willows 2 Mill Drove South Cowbit		
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
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
Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	1	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a householder planning application, seeking permission for the erection of a front and rear extension at The Willows 2 Mill Drove South, Cowbit.

The front extension would run the width of the house, measuring 11.5m (width) by 3m (depth). The eaves height would be 2.5m, rising to 4.5m at its apex, which is consistent with the host dwelling. The rear extension would measure 8.8m (width) by 2.85m (depth). The height of the rear extension would be consistent with the front. Brickwork and rooftiles would match the host, while it is proposed the existing white UPVC doors and windows would be replaced by dark grey.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Cowbit, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The site is located towards the north-east of the settlement, approximately 230m west of the Cowbit/A16 roundabout. The dwelling is located on the corner of Stonegate and Mill Drove South. It forms a visual pair with Acorn Lodge to the north.

Relevant History

H01-0745-93 - Full - Erection of two bungalows and garages - Approved 19/10/93.

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:

Conservation Officer

"No objection. The site is within a degree of proximity to the nearby Grade II listed Cowbit Mill, and is within very close proximity to several NDHAs derived from the historic railway infrastructure. Nevertheless, the diminutive scale of the proposal, as well as the separation distance from the listed mill lead me to conclude that the proposal bears no undue risk to the historic environment"

Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority

"No objection - This proposal is for a single storey front & rear extensions and the access and parking arrangements remain unchanged; therefore, it is considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety."

Environmental Protection

"No comments"

Cowbit Parish Council

Support - The Parish Council sees no issues with this application.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board

Outline circumstances where consent from the Board may be required.

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 a 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. The Reasoned Justification for Policy 2 expands upon these points in Paragraph 3.3.3, stating it is "important that any extension is carefully designed to respect and relate to the original building and integrates sensitively with the character and appearance of the surrounding area."

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.

The proposed extensions are poorly integrated into the host dwelling. With the exception of the height of the extension being consistent with the host, no attempt has been made to integrate the extensions into the host. This lack of integration is particularly visible in the extensions' roofs, which results in an atypical "cross" design. This results in the extensions reading as entirely separate components to the host, affixed without thought to the building's existing appearance. As such, the proposal fails to conform to the requirements of Paragraph 3.3.3 of the SELLP.

The resultant dwelling would, regardless of the integration of the extensions which is considered to be poor, still appear atypical. The perpendicular roof slopes are not present within the wider area, and would appear as an incongruous feature which fails to respect existing design preferences in the area. Given the corner plot location, the effect of this would be exacerbated.

Bungalows in the wider area are relatively uniform currently, both in terms of design features and scale. The increase in scale and the change to the roof would break this uniformity. Moreover, the dwelling currently reads as a pair with the dwelling to the north. The significant front extensions would break this perceived partnership, lessening the existing sense of place in the area. This pairing also means that the impact of any changes to the dwelling would be felt more severely.

Taking account of the design, scale, and nature of the development, as detailed above, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable. The proposal would cause an adverse impact to the character and appearance of the area and would therefore be contrary to 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.

Due to the single storey nature of the dwelling, no additional overlooking would occur. Any views from the extension would be obscured by existing boundary treatments.

A distance of only 0.9m to the western boundary is proposed. At this distance, some level of overshadowing would occur. That being said, the orientation of the roof means that the majority of the shadow would be cast upon the rear garden, rather than the obscuring light to a window. This would still be impactful to occupants of 80 Stone Gate; however, it is not considered to be such a substantial level of overshadowing as to demonstrably worsen the living standards of occupants.

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 not increase the need for onsite parking and would also not reduce existing parking arrangements.

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.

Heritage and Conservation

The Local Planning Authority must ensure special regard to preserving the Listed Buildings and their settings in relation to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act'). No harm should be caused, with the historical assets and their surroundings needing to be preserved or enhanced.

As outlined in the Conservation Officer's comments, the site is near to the Grade II listed Cowbit Mill, and is within close proximity to several NDHAs derived from the historic railway infrastructure. As such, the provisions of Section 16 of the NPPF and Policy 29 of the SELLP are relevant here.

Section 16 of the NPPF states that "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance".

Policy 29A, relating to listed buildings, states: "Proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building."

With respect to non-designated heritage assets, Paragraph 216 of the NPPF states: "The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset"

Whilst the wider historic environment is acknowledged, it is considered that the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact upon these assets. Sufficient distance has been maintained to prevent the site from being immediately visually associated with these assets. Therefore, whilst the works may impact upon the character of the area, there would be only a negligible impact upon the historic environment as association between the two is limited.

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.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states: "Development that is not well designed should be refused".

It is considered that the proposal fails to integrate itself into the host dwelling or the wider area. The proposal would therefore represent an incongruous form of development, at odds with the character of the area. The proposal therefore should be refused as outlined in Paragraph 139 of the NPPF.

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 contrary to Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP, as well as Section 12 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the harm caused by proposal; therefore, the planning balance is against the proposal.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be refused under Delegated Authority.