DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H09-0772-26**	**Applicant:**	**B Smith**
Proposal:	Single Storey Rear Extension with Roof Terrace & Associated Alterations - Retrospective		
Location:	The Old Vicarage St Marks Road Holbeach St Marks		
Terminal Date:	19th October 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
28	The Natural Environment
29	The Historic Environment
30	Pollution
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework August 2026

Section 2 - Plan-making policies (PM1 - 17)
Section 3 - Decision-making policies (DM1 - 10)
Section 4 - Achieving sustainable development (S1 - S6)
Section 12 - Making effective use of land (L1 - 3)
Section 14 - Achieving well-designed places (DP1 - 4)
Section 15 - Promoting sustainable transport (TR1 - 8)
Section 17 - Pollution, public protection and security (P1 - 6)
Section 18 - Managing flood risk and coastal change (F1 - 9)
Section 19 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (N1 - 9)
Section 20 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (HE1 - 10)

Representations:

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

SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for a single storey rear extension with a roof terrace and associated alterations.

Site Description

The site comprises land at The Old Vicarage, St Marks Road, Holbeach St Marks. The site includes a large, detached dwelling that is set within a spacious plot. There is a grade II listed building, The Church of St Marks, located to the east of the site. There are also various protected trees within and around the site.

The site is within the settlement boundary of Holbeach St Marks, as identified by Policy 1 in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (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

H09-0334-12: (TPO Tree Works) - approved 08th June 2012

H09-0799-12: (TPO Tree Works) - approved 23rd November 2012

H09-0040-13: (Full Application) Erection of timber and double glazed conservatory - approved 07th March 2013

H09-0264-13: (Non Material Amendment) Erection of timber and double glazed conservatory - approved under H09-0040-13. Amendments to include position of double doors to side elevation and larger footprint - approved 10th April 2013

H09-0478-16: (TPO Tree Works) Works to Holbeach St Marks TPO No. 1 1985 - approved 08th July 2016

H09-1040-22: (Full Application) Proposed extension and alterations - approved 12th December 2022

Consultation Responses

Responses have been received from the below referenced consultees. The responses are summarised below; however, the responses can be viewed in their entirety on the South Holland website.

Holbeach Parish Council:

No comments.

Lincolnshire County Council - Historic Environment:

Having reviewed the application documents and the updated available Historic Environment information for this application, the proposal is unlikely to have an impact on significant heritage assets. Consequently, no further archaeological input is necessary for this application. Finally, as the proposal includes development that could potentially affect the setting of two adjacent heritage assets (the Grade II listed Church of St Mark and the nearby Grade II listed War Memorial), the SHDC Conservation Officer should be consulted.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS:

This proposal is for a single storey rear extension and the access and parking arrangements remain unchanged; therefore, it is considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board:

Having screened the application, whilst the site in question lies within the Internal Drainage District of the South Holland Internal Drainage Board the proposed application does not meet our threshold for commenting as per our Planning and Byelaw Strategy. Therefore the Board has no comments to make.

Conservation Officer:

Photographs of the extension are requested. Had the application not been retrospective, we would ordinarily have requested a brick sample panel. We would have recommended that the extension have a materials condition requiring details of both the bricks (red for main extension, yellow for stringcourse), keystone, roofing materials, windows and doors.

Tree Officer: No response received.

Cllr N Worth: 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 have been received from members of the public.

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, August 2026 (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:

-Design, Layout and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area;
-Impact on Heritage Assets;
-Impact on Residential Amenity;
-Flood Risk; and
-Biodiversity Net Gain.

These matters are assessed in turn below.

Design, Layout and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

Policy DP3 (Key principles for well-designed places) of the NPPF states that development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan outlines sustainable development considerations for proposals; providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals.

Policy 3 of the Local Plan 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 large, detached building set within a spacious plot. The plot around the dwelling is much larger than the nearest residential plots of land.

The rear extension is proposed on the north-western side of the dwelling. The extension is proposed to measure 4.2m by 9.9m. The extension is proposed to feature a mostly flat roof form, measuring 3.7m in height from the ground level; however, there is a sloped roof on the north-western part of the extension.

At its tallest, the extension would measure 4.7m in height. This is no taller than the garage structure that is located to the east. The garage structure and the church and mature trees to the east of the site provide a significant degree of screening of the extension from the nearest public viewpoints on St Marks Road.

It is considered that the siting and scale of the extension would be suitable as the extension would be proportionate to the host dwelling. Furthermore, the existing screening within and around the site would help minimise the visual impact of the extension.

The extension is proposed to feature brickwork that would match the host dwelling. This would further assist to integrate the extension with the dwelling.

Minor alterations are proposed to the garage structure including the installation of two rooflights. It is considered that the visual impact of these changes is acceptable.

Furthermore, the proposal should not impact on any of the protected trees located within and around the site. As such, the degree of screening provided by these trees would be retained and the verdant character of the site should be retained.

As such, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable visual impact in accordance with Policy DP3 and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan.

Impact on Heritage Assets

Section 20 of the NPPF contains guidance as to how local planning authorities should assess proposals that could affect designated and non-designated heritage. For example, Policy HE5 (Assessing effects on heritage assets) requires proposals affecting heritage assets to be accompanied by an assessment of the significant of the assets affected.

Policy HE6 (Proposals affecting designated heritage assets) of the NPPF sets out that when considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance.

Policy 29 of the Local Plan (Part B) sets out proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building.

In this case, the site is next to a grade II listed building, The Church of St Marks, which is located to

the east of the site. As set out previously, the council's conservation officer requested photographs of the extension to review the brickwork and other materials in more detail. Photographs have been provided to the officer; however, these photographs do not show a close up view of the brickwork. Notwithstanding this, the extension appears to feature closely matching brickwork when viewed from the nearest public viewpoints.

The extension is mostly visible from the north of the site on Church Close which is a small cul-de-sac. Views of the site from Church Close are also filtered through existing trees, hedgerows and a brickwork wall. The extension is only partially visible from St Mark's Road, which is to the south of the site. For example, the existing dwelling and garage building provides a significant degree of screening of the area where the extension is located. It is considered that the filtered views of the site reduces the impact of the development on the setting of the listed building. Furthermore, it is considered that a condition could be included to require the brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing dwelling as closely as possible to integrate the extension with the dwelling, thereby reducing the impact of the proposals on the setting of the listed building. It is noted that a similar condition was included for planning permission H09-1040-22 which granted approval for a larger rear extension than the current proposals.

Due to the subservient scale of the extension and its overall appearance, it is considered that the development would have an acceptable impact on the setting of the listed building, in accordance with Policy 29 of the Local Plan and Section 20 of the NPPF.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy P3 (Living conditions and pollution) of the NPPF sets out that development should provide healthy living conditions for occupiers and users in terms of adequate access to light and avoiding exposure to levels of air, noise, artificial light or other sources of pollution. The policy also sets out that proposals should not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site.

Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan set out that residential amenity and the relationship to existing development and land uses is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

It is considered that the development would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of the nearest dwellings around the site as it is considered that there would be suitable separation distances between the site and the nearest dwelling. For example, although a roof terrace is proposed, the terrace is located 20m from the northern boundary of the site and more than 28m from the western boundary of the site.

The proposed development would not result in significant detrimental impact on the amenity of future occupants or the neighbouring properties. Therefore, the development would accord with Policy P3 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan.

Flood Risk

Section 18 of the NPPF sets out guidance relating to how local authorities should assess and determine applications which are subject to flood risk concerns.

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

Policy 4 of the Local Plan allows for certain types of development within Flood Zones 2 and 3 in instances where specific criteria are met.

The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) provides an overview of how flood risk has been considered in shaping the proposals of the Local Plan; including the spatial strategy and the assessment of housing and employment sites. Within the SFRA, areas across South Holland have been identified according to the level of hazard that is posed in terms of flood risk. Appendix C of the SFRA sets out guidance in terms of the minimum measures that are required according to what hazard category areas fall under. In this case, the site is within a Danger for Most hazard area; however, no specific mitigation is recommended within the SFRA for householder proposals.

Therefore, it is considered that in terms of flood risk, the proposed development accords with Policy

4 of the Local Plan and the Section 18 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.

As such, unless comprising development that is exempt from this mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)(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% BNG requirements as the proposal is a householder development.

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 the amenity of nearby residents. The proposal would have an acceptable impact in terms of the listed building next to the site and in terms of highway safety and flood risk. The proposal accords with the Local Plan and the NPPF when viewed as a whole. 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, 29, 30 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.