DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H03-0301-25**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs Marshall**
Proposal:	Proposed single storey rear extension		
Location:	19 Counter Drain Drove Tongue End Spalding		
Terminal Date:	27th May 2025		

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

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

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
Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

National Guidance

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
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for a single storey rear extension at 19 Counter Drain Drove, Tongue End.

Site Description

19 Counter Drain Drove is a semi-detached two storey dwelling, located within a ribbon of development that is located to the south-east of Counter Drain Drove. The dwelling features red brickwork on the lower part of the building, and white render on the upper half of the building.

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

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

Relevant Planning History

H03-0917-21: (Full Application) Proposed two storey side extension & single storey front extension - re-submission of H03-0465-21 - approved 15 October 2021

H03-0465-21: (Full Application) Proposed Two Storey Side Extension and Single Storey Front Extension - approved 22 June 2021

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.

Deeping St Nicholas Parish Council: The Parish Council sees no issues with this modest extension.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: No objections. It is considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Cllr B Alcock: No response received.

Cllr J Astill: No response received.

Cllr A Harrison: No response received.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust: No response received.

Natural England: 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 letters of representation have been received.

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; and
-Impact on Amenity.

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 Tongue End which falls under the category '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 erection of a single storey extension. Therefore, the principle of such development is appropriate, provided the design of the extension is suitable in terms of its visual and amenity impact.

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 semi-detached two storey dwelling. The dwelling features brickwork on the lower part of its facades, and then render on the upper part of the facades.

The proposed single storey extension would be located on the rear of the dwelling. The proposed extension would not be highly visible from the street scene due to its location, and the extension would be partly screened by an existing garage building which is located next to the site.

The proposed extension would measure 2m by 9.4m, featuring a flat roof which would measure 3m in height. Two roof lanterns are proposed which measure approximately 3.5m from the ground level

to the ridgeline of each lantern.

The proposed extension is proposed to feature rendered walls to match the existing facades and white UPVC windows and doors. The materials are therefore considered to be acceptable. It is considered appropriate to include a condition requiring the colour and texture of the proposed rendering to match the existing 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 proposed siting and scale of the extension, the development would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing. No side windows are proposed, and it is therefore also considered that the extension would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking as there are no dwellings to the rear of 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.

Other Matters

The proposed extension would not alter the parking requirements for the site. As such, the proposals should not result in an adverse impact in terms of highway safety.

The site is located within Flood Zone 3. The site is located within the hazard rating of 'Danger to Some' and 'low hazard', as ¬identified by the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). The proposal is for a single storey rear extension and as such the SFRA does not require any specific mitigation. The NPPF and the Local Plan also do not require specific mitigation for this type of proposal. Therefore, the development is considered to be acceptable in flood risk terms.

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, 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.