

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H09-0544-25 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs M Clark
Proposal: Rear extension to dwelling
Location: Fair View Holbeach Drove Gate Holbeach Drove
Terminal Date: 29th July 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	

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	2	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	1	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a two-storey rear extension.

Site Description

The application site comprises land at Fair View, Holbeach Drove Gate, Holbeach Drove. The site features a two-storey detached dwelling with brickwork facades. The site features a single storey rear extension which is proposed to be replaced by the larger two storey extension.

The site is within the settlement limit of Holbeach Drove, 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 previous applications have been submitted within the site.

Land to the south:

H09-0165-22: (Outline Application) Residential Development - Erection of 1 Dwelling - approved 11 April 2022

H09-0205-25: (Full Application) Erection of 2 Dwellings - approved 04 July 2025

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.

Holbeach Parish Council: No objections.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: Parking needs to be detailed on the proposed site plan. For a four-bed dwelling three parking spaces should be provided.

Whaplode Parish Council: No comments.

National Grid: No observations.

Cllr A C Beal: No response received.

Cllr P A Redgate: 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;
- 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 settlement limit of Holbeach Drove which falls under the category 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. Therefore, the principle of such development is appropriate 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, with a gable end roof form. The dwelling features a single storey rear extension which measures 7m by 2.6m, and a lean-to rear extension which measures 1.7m by 2.5m. Both of these extensions are proposed to be demolished to make way for the proposed two-storey rear extension. The proposed extension measures 4.6m by 7.48m. The height and eaves of the extension would match the main dwelling.

The nearest dwellings on the south-eastern side Holbeach Drove Gate include various single storey dwellings. It is noted that permission has recently been granted for two dwellings under permission H09-0205-25. If constructed, both dwellings would feature two storeys.

Extensions should not dominate the original building in terms of their scale or siting. Extensions should also generally be subservient and proportionate to the original building. In this case, it is not considered that the scale, siting or appearance of the extension would be acceptable. The scale of

the extension would be excessive. The extension would be as tall as the main dwelling and feature the same width. Whilst this might be acceptable in some cases such as single storey properties, in this case, the overall scale and bulk of the extension is considered to comprise a disproportionate addition, which would visually dominate the host dwelling.

There are open views of the site from the street scene. The applicant has referred to the two dwellings that have recently been approved to the south of the site under permission H09-0205-25, setting out that these dwellings would screen the extension from view along the street scene. If constructed, the approved dwellings would provide a degree of screening, however, the proposed extension would nonetheless be clearly visible and open to extensive views which would exacerbate the visual harm that would be caused from the adjacent street scene.

The proposed materials for the extension are not set out within the submitted plans, however, the application form sets out that the proposed facades would feature 'Weber Mushroom' render. The existing dwelling features red brickwork. According to the application form, the existing brickwork features an imperial measurement and as such, any brickwork on the extension would not match up due to the different coursing that is used. Whilst this is acknowledged, it is not considered that the proposed rendered facades would be suitable in this case. The proposed render would exacerbate the harmful impact of the extension on the street scene by adding a disproportionate and visually incongruous addition to the dwelling that is not in keeping with the character of the host dwelling or the surrounding built environment.

The proposed extension would be of an excessive scale compared to the main dwelling and the proposed rendered facades would exacerbate the visual harm of the proposals. The extension is not considered to be a suitable or sympathetic addition. Furthermore, the limited benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the visual harm that would arise to the locality. As such, the development would cause an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and would therefore not accord with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan or 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 of neighbouring properties. This includes the two dwellings that have been approved, though not yet constructed, under permission H09-0205-25.

The proposed extension would also not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking with neighbouring dwellings. For example, no windows are proposed on the side elevations at the first floor level other than for an en-suite bathroom. Obscure glazing is proposed on this en-suite bathroom window to prevent an unacceptable degree of overlooking. Windows are proposed on the southern side elevation which would connect to a living room area. These windows would be approximately 3.3m from the boundary with one of the proposed dwellings that has been granted consent under permission H09-0205-25. A 1.8m high timber fence is proposed between the dwellings and it is considered that this boundary treatment should help to prevent an unacceptable degree of overlooking.

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.

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 proposed development would materially harm the character and appearance of the locality. The proposed development therefore does not accord with the Local Plan or the NPPF. In this instance, it is not considered that the provision of additional living space for the dwelling represents a sufficient material consideration that outweighs the harm that would result from the proposal. As such, the planning balance is against 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

The proposed development would comprise a disproportionate addition to the host dwelling. The scale and design of the extension is considered to be unsuitable, comprising an excessively large form of development which would be significantly at odds with the character of the area and harmful to the street scene. The proposed rendered facades would further exacerbate the visual harm of the proposals. Therefore, the development would comprise an unduly dominant and incongruous development.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be refused under delegated authority.