

**DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING**

**Application No:** H02-0034-26                      **Applicant:** Mr D Doward

**Proposal:** Erection of workshop for storage of motorhome and boats, render existing dwelling with new porch and replace windows to front elevation

**Location:** Red Roof 185a Nene Terrace Road Crowland

**Terminal Date:** 13th March 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

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 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

**Representations:**

	<b>Object</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>No Obj.</b>	<b>Comments</b>
PARISH COUNCIL	0	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
NORTH LEVEL INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	1	0
---------------	---	---	---	---

## **CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT**

### **Proposal**

The application seeks full planning permission for the following works:

- A workshop / storage building at the rear of the site;
- The rendering of the existing dwelling;
- A new porch on the front elevation of the dwelling; and
- Removal of bay windows on the front elevation of the dwelling and replacement with flat windows.

Initially, permission was also sought for the erection of a double garage at the front of the site. Concerns were raised with the applicant's agent regarding the visual impact of the garage at the front of the site which could impact on the openness of the street, detracting from the character and appearance of the area. The applicant's agent subsequently agreed to remove the garage from the plans and to instead lengthen the proposed workshop building at the rear of the site by 4m.

### **Site Description**

The site comprises land at 185a Nene Terrace, Crowland. The site is currently features a detached single storey bungalow which is set back from the road frontage at a similar distance as the neighbouring plots.

The site is located within the settlement limit of Nene Terrace, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, and the accompanying policies map.

The site is within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3, as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps.

### **Relevant Planning History**

H02-0240-22: (Full Application) Rear Extension & Alterations - approved 26 April 2022

### **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.

Crowland Parish Council: No objections.

North Level Drainage Board: No objections.

Environmental Protection: No comments regarding land contamination.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: Please ask the applicant to provide a swept path demonstrating that the largest vehicle likely to use the site can enter and leave the site in a forward gear.

Clr B Alcock: No response received.

Clr J R Astill: No response received.

Clr A Harrison: 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 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;
- 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 limit of Nene Terrace, which falls under the category of 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. Policy 1 sets out that development in this type of settlement 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 Committed sites and infill.

In this case, the proposal solely relates to the alteration and extension of an existing dwelling and the erection of an outbuilding. Therefore, the principle of such development is appropriate, comprising an appropriate form of development for the location. This is provided the proposals are suitable in terms of their visual and amenity impact and other material considerations.

### 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 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 existing dwelling comprises a detached single storey bungalow with a gable end roof form. There is a flat roofed rear extension on the dwelling. The dwelling is set back from the road frontage at a similar distance as the other nearest dwellings. Whilst plot sizes vary within the street scene, there is a general building line.

The proposal seeks consent to render the existing dwelling; however, the render colour is unconfirmed at this stage. There is a mixture of materials within the area including red brickwork and rendered facades. As such, the proposed rendering of the dwelling is acceptable. A planning condition is recommended to provide further details of the proposed render colour.

A front porch is proposed on the south-western elevation of the dwelling measuring 2m in length and 2.8m in width. The porch is proposed to feature a gable end roof form measuring 3.3m in height up to the ridgeline and 2.3m up to the eaves. The porch is considered to be suitably sized and positioned compared with the dwelling and as such, the visual impact of the porch is acceptable. Furthermore, the porch would feature rendered facades to match the dwelling, helping to integrate the porch.

It is proposed to remove the existing frontage bay windows and replace these windows with flat windows. The visual impact of this is also acceptable.

A workshop / storage building is proposed at the rear of the site. The building is proposed to measure 16.5m in length and 8m in width. A mono-pitch roof is proposed measuring 4m at its tallest point. This has been reduced as the building was initially proposed to be 5m in height and this was considered to be too tall for an outbuilding, particularly compared to the host dwelling in this instance which measures 5.2m in height.

Using permitted development rights, outbuildings can measure 3m in height if a mono-pitch roof is proposed. The building is proposed to be 4.2m from the eastern boundary of the site, and 4.7m from the western boundary of the site. As such, it is considered that there would be suitable separation distances from the site boundaries in this instance, helping to reduce the impact of the building on neighbouring dwellings. The building would feature a relatively commercial / agricultural appearance with 4 roller shutter doors and juniper green cladding. The building would be located towards the rear of the site and as such, the building would not be overly prominent within the street scene or highly visible from the surrounding area. Therefore, the visual impact of the building is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

The length of the building was increased by approximately 4m during the determination of the application. The length was increased to allow for additional space as the applicant agreed to remove the frontage garage that was initially proposed. Even with the increased length, there would be suitable separation distances with the site boundaries. As such, it was not considered necessary to re-consult neighbours on the impact of this change as it was considered that the building would not cause an overbearing impact due to its scale and positioning.

Overall, the visual impact of the proposed development is acceptable. The development would not cause an adverse impact to the character or 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.

Due to the scale and siting of the proposed outbuilding, the building would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing or have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties. For example, whilst the outbuilding is 1m taller than permitted development rights would allow for, the building is proposed to be sited at least 4m from the nearest boundaries, helping to reduce its impact on neighbouring properties.

The proposals would also not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking as no additional windows are proposed on the existing dwelling within the site.

Therefore, the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of neighbouring properties and future occupants would be acceptable. As such, the proposed development accords with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 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.

The site is located within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3. Policy 4 of the Local Plan sets out that development within Flood Zones 2 and 3 can be permitted in instances where specific criteria is met.

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 not identified within a hazard rating area and the proposal is for a householder development.

As such, no specific mitigation is recommended within the SFRA. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that a soakaway is proposed within the front garden area of the site to accommodate the surface water run off from the front porch. As a sustainable means of drainage, the use of a soakaway is encouraged.

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 and drainage.

### 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.

When taking the above into account, in this instance the application is exempt from the statutory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirements.

## **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 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 and 4 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.