PLANNING STATEMENT

Part-retrospective application: existing first-floor extension and proposed remedial external alterations

Site	The Old Ship Inn, Beck Bank, Gosberton Clough, Spalding, PE11 4JL
Applicant	M Choudry
Prepared by	ARC Survey & Design Consultants Ltd
Date	November 2026

1. Introduction and purpose

This Planning Statement has been prepared on behalf of the applicant in support of a revised, part-retrospective householder planning application at The Old Ship Inn, Beck Bank, Gosberton Clough. The application seeks permission for the first-floor extension and associated alterations already undertaken without planning permission, in conjunction with a programme of proposed remedial external works designed to achieve a more sympathetic and unified appearance.

At the date of this application, the reconstructed first floor remains in its existing grey-clad condition. The replacement rendered finish, revised wall profile and associated elevation improvements shown on the proposed drawings have not yet been carried out. The applicant is not seeking permission to retain the current grey-clad appearance unchanged; the revised rendered design is the scheme now put forward for the Council's consideration.

Retrospective application H08-0421-26 was refused on 6 August 2026 on grounds relating to the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings. An appeal against that refusal is progressing separately. This application presents an alternative amended scheme for assessment on its own planning merits and does not seek to prejudge the outcome of the appeal.

The revised design was considered by South Holland District Council through pre-application enquiry HPE-0967-26. In its response dated 15 October 2026, the Council identified substantial improvements over the refused design and considered the revised proposal potentially acceptable, while noting some remaining reservations. This statement explains how the proposal responds to that advice.

2. The site and its context

The Old Ship Inn is a former public house which has operated as a residential dwelling for a substantial period. The Council's pre-application response notes that permission for its conversion to a dwellinghouse appears to have been granted under SR209/70 (H08-0209-70). Accordingly, the present application concerns alterations and extensions to an existing dwelling rather than a change of use.

The building occupies a prominent roadside position adjoining Beck Bank, near its junction with Clough Road. Its elongated form and close relationship with the highway make the principal elevation particularly visible within the street scene. Before the unauthorised works, the dwelling was characterised by predominantly white-rendered external walls, a traditional red pantile roof and a comparatively simple appearance.



Historic roadside appearance (image supplied by applicant, December 2021).



Existing grey-clad upper-storey condition, as recorded in the previous statement.

The present upper-storey cladding contrasts sharply with the retained rendered ground floor. This contrast, together with the projecting wall profile, was central to the previously identified design concerns.

3. Relevant planning history and pre-application advice

- H08-0563-15 – proposed self-contained annexe; refused 21 August 2015.
- H08-1039-15 – proposed self-contained annexe (resubmission); approved 22 December 2015.
- H08-0421-26 – retrospective refurbishment and alterations to dwelling; refused 6 August 2026. The refusal is currently subject to an appeal.
- HPE-0967-26 – pre-application advice on a revised design, dated 15 October 2026.

The former application was refused for a single reason concerning visual bulk, proportions and the integration of materials with the host dwelling and wider setting. The previous officer report also recorded that residential amenity and highway safety did not justify refusal. The revised application is directed principally at resolving the design concerns, while retaining the functional internal accommodation.

4. Existing works and revised development proposed

4.1 Existing unauthorised condition

The first-floor reconstruction and extension have already been undertaken, including the raised roof and eaves levels, the grey/blue-grey upper-storey cladding, the projecting first-floor wall treatment and the rear flat-roof element. These works remain in place and are not described in this statement as works yet to be constructed. The previous officer report recorded an approximate ridge height of 6.5m, eaves height of 4.9m and rear flat-roof height of 5.6m; the pre-works heights were estimates rather than measured survey levels.

4.2 Proposed remedial alterations

The amended scheme, as shown on the submitted proposed drawings, comprises:

- Complete removal of the existing dark grey/blue-grey first-floor cladding and replacement with white render.
- Re-rendering of the ground floor, where required, to achieve a consistent finish across the building.
- Reworking of the projecting first-floor wall build-up to provide a substantially flush and continuous external wall plane, removing the overhanging visual effect criticised in the refusal.
- Removal of the small roadside roof feature identified in the pre-application proposals, together with alterations to the fenestration, including two additional first-floor windows to the principal elevation.
- Retention of the existing overall height and roof form, including the rear flat-roof element; no further increase in ridge height or overall massing is proposed.

The purpose of the amended works is visual consolidation rather than additional enlargement. The result would be a predominantly rendered dwelling with a consistent relationship between ground- and first-floor elevations, rather than the current contrasting upper-storey cladding.

5. Planning policy context

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The relevant development plan is the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011–2036 (adopted March 2019), with particular relevance to Policies 1 (Spatial Strategy), 2 (Development Management) and 3 (Design of New Development). Policies 33 and 36 are also relevant insofar as transport and parking considerations arise.

The National Planning Policy Framework, published in August 2026, is a material consideration. Policy S5 addresses specified forms of development outside settlements, including proportionate extensions and alterations to existing lawful buildings of permanent and substantial construction. Policy DP3 concerns contextual design, the integration of development with its surroundings and a coherent palette of materials and architectural features. The National Design Guide provides further guidance on context, identity and built form.

The Council's pre-application response treated the application site as outside the settlements defined by the adopted Local Plan and assessed the principle of development with reference to Policy S5. This statement adopts that approach. The Council concluded that the principle of the revised extensions and alterations was acceptable, subject to their detailed planning merits.

6. Planning assessment

6.1 Principle and scale of development

The application relates to an established residential building and does not seek to introduce a new dwelling or a different use. The Council's pre-application response accepted the principle of alterations to the existing building under Policy 1 of the Local Plan and Policy S5 of the NPPF, noting that the height increase was proportionate to the building. The present scheme retains the constructed height but proposes no additional enlargement beyond the external alterations needed to remedy the existing appearance.

6.2 Appearance, materials and perceived bulk

The key objection to the refused scheme was not the height of the building alone, but the combined visual effect of the raised first floor, the projecting wall profile and the dark cladding above a rendered ground floor. Those features produced a pronounced division between the two storeys and accentuated the apparent mass of the long roadside elevation.

The revised proposal directly responds to these concerns. A substantially flush wall plane will remove the conspicuous first-floor overhang, while white render across both storeys will provide a restrained and continuous finish. This design takes its cue from the historic appearance of the building and is more compatible with the material character of the surrounding area. The additional principal-elevation windows will also relieve the starkness of the long façade and introduce a more balanced composition.

The pre-application officer specifically considered the rendered treatment appropriate, recognised that removing the overhang would improve integration, and regarded the additional first-floor windows as an improvement. The officer further noted that a building with a ridge height of approximately 6.5m would not be incongruous in isolation and that the revised massing would not be so significant as to cause immediate harm to the character or appearance of the area. These comments provide support for assessing the amended design distinctly from the refused scheme.

6.3 Retained height and internal accommodation

Reducing the existing first-floor height would materially affect the usability of the accommodation. As described in the earlier statement, the ground floor has been arranged around ceiling heights of approximately 2.4m, while the first floor includes vaulted ceilings with an internal eaves height of approximately 2.14m. A further reduction in roof and eaves levels would compromise these already constrained spaces.

These practical considerations do not remove the need for acceptable design. They do, however, explain why the applicant proposes to retain the existing roof levels and instead remedy the elements which most strongly contribute

to perceived bulk. The Council's pre-application response acknowledged the retained height and considered the scheme, on balance, a significant improvement.

6.4 Rear flat-roof element

The retained rear first-floor flat-roof element was identified in the pre-application response as a less successfully integrated feature, particularly because the flat roof sits above the main eaves. That concern is acknowledged. The element is retained to preserve the internal arrangement and headroom of the existing accommodation. It is positioned to the rear and, as the Council noted, is not visible from the public realm, which lessens its contribution to the wider street scene.

The applicant submits that the residual concern associated with this rear element should be weighed against the extensive improvements to the publicly prominent roadside elevation and to the appearance of the building as a whole. The revised scheme does not rely on a claim that all aspects of the existing construction are ideal; rather, it provides a proportionate package of remedial works that addresses the main reasons for the earlier refusal.

6.5 Residential amenity, highway safety and parking

The previous application was not refused on residential amenity or highway grounds. The pre-application response similarly identified no harmful overlooking from the proposed roadside windows and found that the orientation of the building limited potential overshadowing effects on neighbouring residential accommodation. The revised design does not propose a further height increase, and no additional adverse amenity effects are anticipated.

The established residential use and existing access arrangements would remain unchanged. The earlier application raised no material parking or highway concerns. The pre-application response made clear that the Highway Authority had not been reconsulted at that stage; therefore, any formal highway comments on this application remain a matter for the Council's normal consultation process.

7. Response to the pre-application consultation

The Council's advice of 15 October 2026 provides an important material consideration. Its main findings are summarised below.

Matter	Council advice / revised response
Grey cladding and inconsistent finishes	White render to both storeys and re-rendering of the ground floor were considered a more appropriate and consistent material approach.
First-floor overhang and visual bulk	Removal of the projecting wall effect was welcomed as an improvement to the building silhouette and integration of the two storeys.
Principal elevation fenestration	Additional first-floor windows were considered to improve balance and visual interest. Window product/design information should accompany the application.
Retained height	The approximate 6.5m overall height was not considered incongruous in isolation; the revised proposal reduced perceived bulk.
Rear flat roof	The flat-roof element remained a design reservation, but its rear location and lack of public visibility reduced its impact.

The advice concluded that the proposal represented a significant improvement over H08-0421-26 and that the revised design was potentially acceptable. The applicant recognises that pre-application advice is an officer opinion and does not bind the Council's determination of this application.

8. Conclusion

This part-retrospective application seeks permission for the first-floor extension and alterations already undertaken, subject to the further remedial works now proposed. The existing grey-clad upper-storey treatment remains in place at present; it is not the finish for which approval is sought under the revised scheme.

The new proposal directly addresses the sole reason for refusal of H08-0421-26 by replacing the dark cladding with a coherent rendered finish, reworking the projecting first-floor profile and improving the roadside fenestration. It retains

the existing roof height for functional reasons but does not propose any further increase in scale. The remaining concern regarding the rear flat-roof element is acknowledged and must be considered in its less publicly prominent context.

The Council's pre-application response recognises the significant improvement in design and indicates that the revised approach is potentially acceptable. Having regard to that advice, the historic rendered appearance of the building and the provisions of Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan and Policies S5 and DP3 of the 2026 NPPF, it is considered that the amended development offers an appropriate means of resolving the previously identified design harm. Planning permission is therefore respectfully sought for the scheme as shown on the submitted proposed drawings.

Reference documents

- South Holland District Council: refusal decision and officer report, H08-0421-26.
- South Holland District Council: pre-application response, HPE-0967-26, dated 15 October 2026.
- South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011–2036 (adopted March 2019).
- National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026), including Policies S5 and DP3.
- National Design Guide and application drawings submitted with this application.