DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H13-0230-26**	**Applicant:**	**Mr P Matthews**
Proposal:	Erection of first floor extension, including creation of a dormer window, rear one and a half storey extension and erection of single storey side and rear extension		
Location:	34 High Street Moulton Spalding		
Terminal Date:	7th May 2026		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
29	The Historic Environment
33	Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a householder planning application for the erection of a first floor extension, including creation of a dormer window, rear one and a half storey extension and erection of single storey side and rear extension.

The entire dwelling would be raised, converting the dwelling from a single storey to a one and half storey property. This would see the eaves raised by approximately 0.2m (4.6m final height) and the ridge raised by approximately 1.9m (6m final height). As a part of the vertical extension, a dormer window is proposed. This box dormer would measure 2m (height) by 2.4m (depth) by 2.6m (width). The rear extension would continue at the same height. It would run the width of the dwelling, and would protrude by 2m.

A single storey wrap around extension is proposed. This would partially take the place of the existing garage. This would have a width of between 2.5m at its narrowest to 3.18m (width to the rear). The extension would have a total depth of 10m, with a maximum height of 2.95m.

The extensions, bar the dormer, would be constructed of brickwork to match. The tiles of the roof would match the existing dwelling also. The dormer would be white weatherboarding. White UPVC doors and windows are proposed.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Moulton, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The dwelling is located fairly centrally in the settlement, approximately 130m south of the Grade I listed Moulton Mill. The conservation area also lies within close proximity to the site to the north.

Open fields, allocated for residential development Mou035, are present to the north and east. Residential dwellings are located to the south and west. The property is a single-storey bungalow, dating from the mid-20th century. In the wider area, there is an eclectic mix of dwelling scales and types.

Relevant History

No relevant history.

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the initial consultation exercises, which can be viewed in their entirety through the South Holland website, can be summarised as follows:

Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority

Additional information required - The parking needs to be detailed on the proposed block plan - a 3-bed dwelling should have two parking spaces.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board

Thank you for your consultation on planning application H13-0230-26. 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

I write to confirm my objections to H13-0230-26.

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF confirms that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of what degree of potential harm is involved. This paragraph also de-facto establishes that it is possible to categorise harm into 'substantial harm', 'total loss', or 'less than substantial harm'.

Paragraph 213 goes on to confirm that any harm to or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification.

Paragraph 215 then confirms that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

With regard to the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), Policy 29 covers the nature of this proposal and the preliminary text of that Policy covers several relevant points, stating:

"Distinctive elements of the South East Lincolnshire historic environment will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced. Opportunities to identify a heritage asset's contribution to the economy, tourism, education and the local community will be utilised including:

The historic archaeological and drainage landscape of the Fens;
The distinctive character of South East Lincolnshire market towns and villages;
The dominance within the landscape of church towers, spires and historic windmills;
To respect the historical legacy, varied character and appearance of South East Lincolnshire's historic environment, development proposals will conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated assets, such as historic buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments, street patterns, streetscapes, landscapes, structures and their settings through high-quality sensitive design."

Policy 29A, concerning development relating specifically to Listed Buildings states the following in subsection 3:

"Proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building."

Policy 29B, concerning development relating specifically to Conservation Areas states the following relevant points:

"Proposals within, affecting the setting of, or affecting views into or out of, a Conservation Area should preserve (and enhance or reinforce, as appropriate) features that contribute positively to the area's character, appearance and setting. Proposals should:

1. Retain buildings/groups of buildings, existing street patterns, historic building lines and ground surfaces;

4. Retain and reinforce local distinctiveness with reference to height, massing, scale, form, materials and plot widths of the existing built environment;

5. Assess, and mitigate against, any negative impact the proposal might have on the townscape, roofscape, skyline and landscape;"

With the above in mind, as the proposal relates to development both in the setting of a Grade I listed building (Moulton Mill) and within visual range of the boundary of the Moulton Conservation Area, it is reasonable to suggest that this is a sensitive site from a heritage conservation perspective, despite the relative modernity of the extant dwellings. Development on this site bears a significant potential to substantially affect the setting of the Mill as well as the nearby conservation area. The above policy discussion establishes that there are grounds upon which the LPA may critically consider the effect of a development upon the setting of a listed building, and of views into a conservation area, even if that development is not itself proposed within the conservation area boundary.

At this site, views towards the Grade I listed mill are views that are also into the conservation area which terminates just a short distance further north along High Street.

Views of the Moulton Mill are a critical character aspect of both the Mill itself and of the associated conservation area, and are currently best preserved when travelling along High Street in a northbound direction, as development on this eastern side of that road is chiefly single storey in nature as the built form approaches the village centre, effectively permitting growing views of the mill tower progressing towards the village centre from the junction of High Street and Cob Gate.

The applicant has very kindly provided 3D visualisations, which in my opinion confirm that by raising the height of this property by an additional chalet-style storey would cause a partial block of these significant views of both the mill and the conservation area as travelling north along High Street. The proposal would therefore materially detracts from the quality and significance of views of the mill tower and therefore into the conservation area as approaching the village from the south. As such, I confirm that I consider this form of development to represent 'less than substantial harm' to both the Grade I mill and the Moulton conservation area.

The following therefore apply;

The proposal fouls the requirements of the preliminary text of Policy 29 of the SELLP, by harming the dominance of the historic windmill within the landscape, as well as by harming the conservation area, streetscape, landscape and the setting of the nearby listed building.

The proposal fouls the requirements of Policy 29A(3) of the SELLP as a result of harming the setting of the listed building and therefore neither preserving nor enhancing its significance.

The proposal fouls the requirements of Policy 29B of the SELLP by harming views into the Moulton conservation area.

Moving to the NPPF, as the proposal is assessed as a form of harm to both the Grade I mill and the conservation area. Per paragraph 213, the proposal therefore requires clear and convincing justification. No such justification has been provided, save for the provided 3D visualisations, which in the view of the LPA, confirms the degree of harm associated with the proposal. The proposal therefore fails to satisfy Para. 213.

Per Para. 215, harm may be balanced against any public benefit. No justification of public benefit has been provided. However, given that the proposal is for a domestic extension to an existing dwelling, it can be confirmed that very little or no public benefit is identified against which to balance the harm, as the benefit of the proposal would be wholly to the private owner of the proposal site.

With the above in mind I recommend that the application be refused.

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

Evaluation

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, 2024 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Principle of Development

Policy 1 of the SELLP 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 of Moulton which is classed as minor service centre within Policy 1. As such development will be permitted that supports Moulton's role as a service centre, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities.

As the site is within Moulton's, development within this location is considered appropriate. In any event, the proposal solely relates to the extension of an existing and established residential dwelling and therefore, the principle of such development is considered to be appropriate.

As such, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the requirements of the SELLP when viewed in principle. This is subject to the assessment against site specific criteria; including (but not limited to) the impact of the proposal on the character or appearance of the area, impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers, and impact on highway safety, which are discussed in turn in the following sections.

Layout, Design, Scale and Consideration of the Character of the Area and Historic Environment

Policy Context - Design

Section 12 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", states that the "creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve" and as such, it is generally accepted that good design plays a key role towards sustainable development.

Paragraph 135, contained within Section 12 of the NPPF, states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area (including beyond the short term) and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. This goes on to establish that it is important that new development should be of the highest quality, to enhance and reinforce good design characteristics, and that decisions must have regard towards the impact that the proposed development would have on local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting such as topography, street patterns, building lines, boundary treatment and through scale and massing. Developments 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, among other considerations.

Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP 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. Furthermore, Policy 3 of the SELLP 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.

These policies accord with the provisions of the NPPF and require that design which is inappropriate to the local area, or which fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area, will not be acceptable. Proposals for new development would therefore require the aforementioned considerations to be adequately assessed and designed, including the siting, design, and scale to be respectful of surrounding development and ensure that the character of the area is not compromised.

Policy Context - Historic Environment

Heritage and Conservation

Whilst the application site is not itself listed, or in the Conservation Area, when viewed from the south, there is a prominent view of Moulton Mill. As such, there would be a degree of impact upon views of a listed asset, thereby representing an impact (however minor) upon the setting of the listed building. The site is also approximately 75m south of the Conservation Area, with limited development in between, creating a relationship between the two.

As such, the site lies within the setting of both the grade I listed mill and the conservation area.

In assessing proposals of this nature, the Local Planning Authority must ensure special regard to preserving the Listed Buildings and their settings in relation to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act'). No harm should be caused with the historical assets and their surroundings requiring to be preserved or enhanced.

The NPPF expresses the importance of considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets; advising that development and alterations to designated assets and their settings can cause harm. These policies ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic buildings and environments. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance should be treated favourably.

Section 16 of the NPPF states that "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great 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 harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance".

Paragraph 220 expands upon this, in relation to Conservation Areas, stating:
"Not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 214 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 215, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole".

Policy 29 (The Historic Environment) states amongst other matters that the distinctive elements of the South East Lincolnshire historic environment will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced, in keeping with the policies in the NPPF. Development proposals will be expected to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated and non-designated heritage assets. Policy 29 is broken into five interrelated sections, with parts A, and B relevant here.

Policy 29A, relating to listed buildings, states: "Proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building."

Policy 29B, relating to conservation areas, states: "Proposals within, affecting the setting of, or affecting views into or out of, a Conservation Area should preserve (and enhance or reinforce, as appropriate) features that contribute positively to the area's character, appearance and setting. Proposals should:
1. Retain buildings/groups of buildings, existing street patterns, historic building lines and ground surfaces;
2. Retain architectural details that contribute to the character and appearance of the area;
3. Where relevant and practical, remove features which are incompatible with the Conservation Area;
4. Retain and reinforce local distinctiveness with reference to height, massing, scale, form, materials and plot widths of the existing built environment;
5. Assess, and mitigate against, any negative impact the proposal might have on the townscape, roofscape, skyline and landscape;"

To this end, all proposals visible from the Conservation Area or which affect listed buildings should preserve or enhance their settings.

Assessment

The use of materials to match the host would help naturalise the changes. They would appear as natural additions, rather than a cumbersome new feature. This is with the exception of the dormer, which would be finished in weatherboard.

The flat roof extension is not an overly appealing feature, although it is a common one to some degree. The roof height would be slightly above the eaves of the dwelling, making the relationship more awkward and further exacerbates the awkward and detrimental addition.

The proposed dormer window would face onto a currently vacant plot. Whilst the site is an allocated site within the Local Plan, no scheme for the site has come forward or been approved, meaning limited weight may be attached to the point. As such, the dormer would be highly prominent as one travels north to south. The dormer is not a particularly common feature in the area, and is not an overly attractive feature, as designed. On that basis, there would be a degree of juxtaposition with the dwelling and the wider area. The effect of this would exacerbate any impact upon the Conservation Area, as this would represent a key view out of the Conservation Area.

Within the wider area, there is a reasonable variety of dwelling types, with scales and designs varying. However, along the east side of this section of the High Street (between the turning to Cob Gate and the allocated site to the north) there is a clear preference for low lying bungalows.

The proposed extensions, taken cumulatively, would result in a far larger dwelling; however, the footprint would still be broadly consistent with the wider area. That being said, the increase in height would break the existing regularity along the grouping of dwellings along the eastern portion of the road. Likewise, within the wider area, whilst there are two storey dwellings, there are no one and a half storey dwellings, meaning that the resultant dwelling would appear as somewhat of an outlier.

As outlined previously, as one travels south to north along High Street, there is a prominent view of the Grade I listed Moulton Mill. This view of the Mill is a defining feature in the area and contributes positively to the character of the area. This has been outlined by the Conservation Officer's comments, stating:
"Views of the Moulton Mill are a critical character aspect of both the Mill itself and of the associated conservation area, and are currently best preserved when travelling along High Street in a northbound direction, as development on this eastern side of that road is chiefly single storey in nature as the built form approaches the village centre, effectively permitting growing views of the mill tower progressing towards the village centre from the junction of High Street and Cob Gate"

The proposal, from the information provided, would obscure existing views of the Mill from this site. This has been evidenced further through the 3d visuals submitted during the application process, which themselves illustrate the additional lose of view towards the mill from specific vantage points.

Whilst it is noted and appreciated that not all views towards the mill would be disrupted and it is noted that the existing built form comprises an existing screen to an extent, it is evident that the view from specific elements of the approach along High Street would be further impeded and in turn, would imapct upon how the asset is appreciated form these areas. Whilst the applicant has outlined that the proposal relates to an existing domestic bungalow within an established built-up frontage and states that it would remain clearly subservient to the mill in scale, height and visual hierarchy, the proposed increase in height evidently lessens the visibility and appreciation of the listed mill from certain vantage points towards the application site looking towards the asset, however extensive this may be.

It should be noted that Grade I buildings are of exceptional interest and only around 2.5% of listed buildings are Graded Grade I.

As a result, it is considered that there would be a negative impact upon the setting of the listed building, and by extension the Conservation Area, which is defined by its relationship to the Mill.

As outlined previously, Policy 29A requires all proposals which affect the setting of a listed building to better reveal or preserve the significance of the building. The proposal would do neither, as views of the building would be masked.

The Conservation Officer has identified less than substantial harm emerging from this proposal. In line with Paragraph 215 of the NPPF, said harm would have to be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. The benefits of the proposal would be solely for the occupants, with no wider public benefits emerging.

On this basis, whilst taken in isolation of the historic environment, the impact of the development would not be overly significant, when views of Moulton Mill and the Conservation Area are considered, less than substantial harm is identified. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Section 16 of the NPPF and Policy 29 of the SELLP, as well as Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF in terms of design.

Impacts Upon Residential 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.

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

Whilst the distance to the boundary is low, any shadow cast would chiefly fall either within the plot itself or on the north facing elevation of No.36. As this elevation is blank, bar a front door which would logically expect only limited sunlight, the impact is judged to be low.

The proposed bedroom windows would offer no obtrusive views. The landing's roof light would be positioned above the neighbouring dwelling, preventing harmful overlooking. The dormer would face onto a field. Whilst this site is allocated, as no application has been submitted to the Council, this point is only given minimal weight.

As detailed above, the scale and design of the proposal is considered to have no significant or unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties or land users, when also taking account of the conditions recommended. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan in terms of impact upon residential amenity.

Highway Safety and Parking

Section 9 of the NPPF is titled 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Within this, Paragraph 116 advises 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, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios".

In respect of highway matters, Policy 2 details 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 33 further reinforces the need for developments to be accessible via sustainable modes of transport.

Policy 36 of the SELLP, in conjunction with Appendix 6, sets out minimum vehicle parking standards and requires at least two spaces for dwellings of up to three bedrooms and three spaces for dwellings with four or more bedrooms.

Whilst a garage would be removed, adequate parking space would remain. It should be noted that, reasonably, the loss of the garage could occur through the rights offered by the General Permitted Development Order, 2015, so this point only attracts minimal weight.

The proposal would therefore be acceptable and would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety in accordance with Policies 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Section 9 of the NPPF.

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.

Less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade I listed Moulton Mill and the conservation area has been identified through the obscuring of views of the asset. The proposal would offer no public benefits, and as such, would not be considered to outweigh the identified harm.

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 these factors into consideration, the proposal is considered to contrary to Policy 29 of the SELLP, as well as Section 12 and 16 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the harm identified; therefore, the planning balance is against the proposal.

Recommendation

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