DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H09-0340-25**	**Applicant:**	**Mr M Burns**
Proposal:	Proposed Two Storey Extension & Alterations to Vehicular Access		
Location:	62 Boston Road South Holbeach Spalding		
Terminal Date:	11th June 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
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 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	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	1
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
RESIDENTS	1	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for a two storey side extension and alterations to the existing vehicular access, including widening the access and extending the dropped kerb in front of the site. Part of the boundary wall along the site frontage is proposed to be demolished to facilitate the alterations to the site access.

The height of the ridgeline of the proposed extension has been reduced during the determination of the application in order for the ridgeline to be in line with the main dwelling. The reduction in the height of the ridgeline was requested to help integrate the extension with the host dwelling, and also to ensure the proposals have an acceptable visual impact within the street scene.

Site Description

The site comprises land at 62 Boston Road, Holbeach. The site features a detached two storey dwelling with a gable end frontage and a hipped roof form towards the rear of the site. There is an existing single storey side extension with a flat roof form and a rear extension.

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

The site is 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.

Cllr N J Chapman: I am concerned that the two houses on either side of this proposal are really quite close, so I would worry that their privacy would be compromised by such a large first floor exterior, and their light would also be reduced which could potentially make their rooms downstairs dark.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: No objections. The proposal would not have an impact on the public highway or surface water flood risk. Highway informatives 03 and 08 are recommended.

Ecology Officer: No response received.

Holbeach Parish Council: No response received.

Cllr S E Hutchinson: No response received.

Cllr T Carter: 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, one letter of representation has been received. The following matters are raised within the representation:

-The extension planned is very large and extremely close to 60 Boston Road South and will significantly affect the amount of natural light that is received. This will affect the utility room, the downstairs cloakroom and the upstairs hallway / landing room, all of which already have limited natural light coming in.

-The size and proximity of the proposed extension to 60 Boston Road South will create a sense of being overshadowed.
-The windows at the back of the extension will invade the privacy in the garden of 60 Boston Road South.

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;
-Highway Safety and Parking;
-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 defined settlement of Holbeach which is a Main Service Centre. In this case, the proposal relates to the erection of a two-storey extension and alterations to the site access. 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 detached two storey dwelling. The dwelling features a gable end frontage and a hipped roof form towards the rear of the site. The dwelling already features a single storey side extension, and a single storey rear extension. The overall scale and appearance of the dwelling is similar to many of the nearest dwellings located to the east of Boston Road South. Most of the nearest dwellings are set back from the road frontage at a similar distance and feature similar roof forms. The nearest dwellings comprise a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings.

It is proposed to demolish the existing single storey side extension which features a flat roof, and to replace this with a two-storey side extension with a hipped roof form. The width and length of the dwelling would remain the same as the proposed extension would not project further outwards than the current extension. Initially, the height of the proposed extension was taller than the main dwelling. The ridgeline height of the extension was proposed to measure 8.2m whereas the ridgeline height of the main dwelling measures 7.6m. The proposals have been discussed with the applicant's agent and the ridgeline of the proposed extension has been reduced down to the height of the main dwelling. This was considered to be necessary to integrate the extension more appropriately within the street scene as the nearest dwellings are all broadly the same height. Some of the nearest dwellings feature two storey side projections and these are generally either the same height as the main part of the dwellings or smaller. The proposed scale and appearance of the proposed extension within the amended plans is therefore considered to be acceptable.

The existing rear extension is proposed to be retained. It is proposed to insert a roof lantern within a central position on the roof of the rear extension and to replace an existing doorway and window with a larger set of doors. Although this part of the site is not visible from the street scene, the visual impact is nonetheless considered to be acceptable.

On the lower part of the proposed extension, red brickwork to match the existing brickwork is proposed. On the upper part of the extension, render is proposed which would also match the existing dwelling. It is proposed to install new roof tiles which would be Marley Modern concrete interlocking tiles in smooth grey. The visual impact of the materials is acceptable.

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 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.

Concerns are raised within the public representation that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking and overshadowing. In terms of the potential degree of overlooking with neighbouring properties, as the two-storey extension is proposed on the southern side elevation, it is necessary to consider the impact on the nearest dwelling to the south which is 60 Boston Road South. It is not considered that the proposals would negatively impact the amenity of 64 Boston Road South which is located to the north of the site due to the positioning and scale of the proposed extension.

Along the southern side elevation, no windows are proposed at the first-floor level. Two windows and a door are proposed at the ground floor level. One of the windows would connect to a bathroom and the other window would connect to a utility room. There is a window on the side elevation of 60 Boston Road South, which is located to the south of the site. There is however a timber fence between the properties which provides some screening. Furthermore, the bathroom window is proposed to feature obscure glazing to reduce the potential for overlooking between the sites. Concerns have been raised within the public representation that the proposed extension

would result in a loss of privacy of the rear garden of 60 Boston Road South. A bedroom window is proposed on the rear elevation of the extension at the first floor level. There is already a bedroom at the rear of the site and it is not considered that the proposed bedroom in this location would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking with the rear garden of 60 Boston Road South. As with most of the nearest properties, 60 Boston Road South features a relatively large rear garden and as such occupants have opportunities for privacy within the garden. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking with 60 Boston Road South.

As set out above, the height of the proposed extension has been reduced during the determination of the application. Although the proposal would result in an increase in the built form above the existing extension, this would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing. For example, the proposed extension features a hipped roof form which helps to reduce its overall scale. The extension might result in some loss of light to one of the ground floor windows on the side elevation of 60 Boston Road South, however, this room is understood to connect to a bathroom or a utility room and as such there should not be an unacceptable loss of light to any habitable rooms. Therefore, due to the proposed siting and scale of the extension, the development would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing.

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 in terms of its amenity impact.

Highway Safety and Parking

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF sets out that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, following mitigation.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan sets out that proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to access and vehicle generation.

Policy 3 details that development proposals will demonstrate how accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways will be secured, where they are relevant to the proposal.

Policy 36 of the Local Plan, in conjunction with Appendix 6, sets out minimum vehicle parking standards.

The existing dwelling features three bedrooms, whereas the proposed development would result in the provision of four bedrooms. Appendix 6 of the Local Plan recommends that at least three parking spaces are provided for dwellings with four or more bedrooms. There is considered to be room for parking within the front driveway and Lincolnshire County Council's Highways and SUDS team have not set out any objections to the proposed development. The highways team have also set out that the proposed alterations to the site access are acceptable.

The proposal would therefore have an acceptable impact in terms of highway safety and as such, the proposal would accord with Policies 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the Local Plan, as well as Section 9 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk

The site is located within Flood Zone 3. The site is located within the hazard rating area of 'Danger to Some', as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). The proposal is for a two storey 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.

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, 3, 4 and 36 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.