

## DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

**Application No:** H03-1192-25      **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs N Andrew  
**Proposal:** Proposed single storey rear extension, front porch and garage  
**Location:** Wensor House Main Road Hop Pole  
**Terminal Date:** 30th January 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:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
WELLAND AND DEEPINGS INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

## **CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT**

### **Proposal**

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension, a front porch and a single storey side extension to provide space for an integrated garage.

### **Site Description**

The application site comprises land at Wensor House, Main Road, Hop Pole. The site includes a detached two-storey dwelling and its associated residential curtilage.

The site is outside any defined settlements, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (March 2019) 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**

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.

Deeping St Nicholas Parish Council: No response received.

Welland and Deepings Internal Drainage Board: No comments.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: This proposal is for single storey rear extension, front porch and garage and the access and parking provisions remain the same; therefore, it is considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

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, no representations from members of the public 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;
- Impact on Amenity;
- Flood Risk;
- 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 outside any defined settlements and is, therefore, within the countryside in planning policy terms. However, 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.

### 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 two-storey dwelling, located to the south of Main Road / Littleworth Drove. The site is mostly surrounded by agricultural land other than Munton House, which is a dwelling located to the south-west, and other sporadic development on either side of Main Road / Littleworth Drove.

The dwelling within the site features a gable end roof form with a flat roofed side extension to the north-east. The proposed development includes the installation of a porch on the front elevation, a single storey side extension to make space for an integrated garage, and a single storey rear extension. All of the extensions feature gable end roof forms and are proposed to feature materials that would match the host dwelling.

The front porch is proposed to measure 3.3m by 2.1m with a window on the front elevation and a front door on the side elevation of the porch. The porch is proposed to be positioned slightly off

centre on the front elevation of the dwelling. This has been queried with the applicant's agent to establish if the porch could be moved to a central position given that the dwelling features a mostly symmetrical front facade, except for the existing side extension. According to the applicant's agent, the front porch has been positioned as shown to maximise circulation space and a more central position was explored but discounted due to an issue with the first floor windows. Whilst it is considered that the visual impact of the porch would be improved if it was positioned more centrally, it was not considered necessary to move the porch in this instance due to the small scale nature of the porch. Furthermore, the existing hedgerow and boundary fencing along the site frontage partially screens views of the site, thereby reducing views of the ground floor frontage of the dwelling.

The side extension is proposed to measure 6.5m by 6.5m, measuring 4.4m up to its ridgeline, and 2.3m up to its eaves. The scale and siting of the extension is acceptable as it would be subservient to the host dwelling.

The rear extension is proposed to measure 3.9m by 3.5m, measuring 3.7m up to its ridgeline, and 2.3m up to its eaves. The scale and siting of the extension is acceptable as it would be subservient to the host dwelling. Furthermore, due to its position at the rear of the dwelling, the extension would not be highly visible from the surrounding area, particularly as there are trees and boundary fencing along the eastern edge of the site which provides screening.

Therefore, the visual impact of the proposed development is acceptable. The proposed 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 extensions, the development would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing of the only neighbouring dwelling, which is Munton House (located to the west of the site).

Two windows are proposed on the western side elevation of the garage extension; however, these windows would not face directly towards habitable rooms within Munton House. As such, the proposal should also not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking with Munton House.

Therefore, the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of Munton House 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

The site is located within Flood Zone 3. The site is not located within a hazard rating area, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). The SFRA categorises various areas within the district under hazard ratings and the SFRA sets out guidance and recommended mitigation measures for different types of development within each of the hazard rating areas. In this case, the site is not within an identified hazard area and furthermore, the SFRA does not identify any specific mitigation measures for householder applications. It is not considered that the development would result in any increased flood risk either within the site or on any surrounding land. The development is therefore acceptable in terms of its flood risk impact.

### 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, the development in this instance 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, 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.