DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H02-0524-25**	**Applicant:**	**Miss A Spendelow**
Proposal:	Proposed Rear Extension		
Location:	2b Peterborough Road Crowland		
Terminal Date:	23rd July 2025		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 4 - Decision-making
Section 11 - Making effective use of land
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

National Guidance

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension. The extension is proposed to feature a hipped roof form, continuing the roofline of the existing dwelling. The materials for the extension are proposed to match the materials of the main dwelling.

Site Description

The application site comprises land at 2b Peterborough Road, Crowland. The site features a single storey detached bungalow.

The site is within the settlement limits of Crowland, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (March 2019) and the accompanying policies map.

The site is mostly within Flood Zone 1, as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps.

Relevant Planning History

No planning applications have previously been submitted within the site.

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.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: No objections. The proposal is for rear extension, and it does not have an impact on the Public Highway or Surface Water Flood Risk.

North Level District Internal Drainage Board: No comments.

Crowland Parish Council: No comments.

Cllr B Alcock: No response received.

Cllr J R Astill: No response received.

Cllr 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, two responses have been received. Both of the responses are from the same household. The initial response requested the proposed plans as the respondent could not find the plans on the council's website. The plans were subsequently sent directly to the respondent. Within the second response, the respondent set out that they agree with the principle of the proposed development, however, the respondent set out that they would object if the proposals diverged from the submitted plans in future.

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; 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 defined settlement of Crowland which is a Main Service Centre. 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. In this case, the proposal solely relates to the extension of an existing dwelling. Therefore, the principle of such development is appropriate, comprising an appropriate form of development for the location. This is however provided the design of the extension is suitable in terms of its 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, located to the east of Peterborough Road. The extension would be located on the rear elevation which comprises the eastern elevation of the dwelling. The extension is proposed to measure 2.75m by 9.3m. The height of the extension would match the height of the main dwelling as the proposal seeks to extend the hipped roof form of the main dwelling. The eaves and ridgeline of the extension therefore would not project above the main dwelling. Therefore, the scale and siting of the extension is considered to be acceptable as the extension would be subservient to the main dwelling.

The proposed materials are not indicated within the submitted plans, however, the materials are set out within the application form. It is proposed that the materials on the extension would match the main dwelling. The visual impact of the proposed development is therefore acceptable. The

proposed development would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area and would therefore accord 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 extension, it is considered that the extension would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing.

No additional windows are proposed on the side elevations of the extension and as such, the proposal should not result in a greater degree of overlooking with neighbouring dwellings. There is also a suitable separation distance between the proposed rear elevation of the extension and the nearest dwelling to the south-east of the site, Greesha.

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.

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.

For applications that are submitted prior to the introduction of this requirement, the development would be exempt from the mandatory 10% requirement and as such, the Biodiversity Gain Condition would not apply. However, this application was submitted following the introduction of this legislation. As such, unless comprising development that is exempt from this mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (10%), a condition would be required, as mandatorily set. When taking the above into account, the development 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. The proposed development therefore 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 and 3 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.