DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H13-0334-25**	**Applicant:**	**Mr H Myers**
Proposal:	Proposed extension, garage conversion to provide living accommodation, demolition of existing outbuilding, erection of new outbuilding, removal of one site access & new boundary treatments including fencing		
Location:	Glebe House Church Lane Moulton		
Terminal Date:	25th July 2025		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
28	The Natural Environment
29	The Historic Environment
31	Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy
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 2 - Achieving Sustainable Development.
Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 14- Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding, and Coastal Change
Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
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	0	0	0	1

INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD				
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	2
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	1	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a householder application for extensions and alterations at Glebe House. The extensions can be divided into two elements: a single storey side extension, and a single-storey rear extension, extending to form a link extension.

The side component would project from the southern elevation, squaring off the existing "T" shape here. The extension would measure 12.5m (depth) by 5.75m (width) with a height of 3.3m. The extension would have a flat roof, which would be utilised as a balcony. A 1m glass rail is proposed on the balcony. The extension would be rendered white.

A single storey rear and side extension is also proposed. The rear element would measure 6.25m (depth) by 6.3m (width). The link would project from this element and connect the host dwelling to the existing two storey garage. This extension would measure 6.1m (depth) by 4m (width). These two extensions feature a gable ended, pitched roof. The eaves height would be set at 2.6m, rising to 5.2m at its apex. The extension would be rendered white.

In addition to these works, it is proposed that the existing two-storey garage block would be converted to form additional living space, being incorporated into the host dwelling via the aforementioned link extension. No external alterations are proposed to facilitate these internal alterations.

An outbuilding is proposed to the rear of the dwelling. This would be clad in timber, although final confirmation of the nature of the materials has not been provided. The outbuilding would measure 10m by 5m. It would feature a dual pitched roof, set at 2.4m to the eaves and 4.9m to the ridge.

Additional boundary treatments are proposed. A 1.8m close-boarded timber fence is proposed around the bulk of the site boundary. An additional 1.8m high fence is proposed along the former southern driveway. The entrance to this driveway would be blocked up and a hedge planted to infill the space. The existing northern entry would be retained; however, a new gate is proposed here. No details of the design of the gate have been provided.

Two sections of photovoltaic panels are proposed. The first along the southern ridge line of the main dwelling, and the second on the southern ridge of the outbuilding. An air source heat pump is proposed to the rear.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Moulton, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The site is located fairly centrally within the village, approximately 75m south of Moulton Park. To the immediate west is Moulton River. The site is within the Conservation Area, with a Grade II listed building to the immediate north and east.

The existing house is a large, brick built building in the centre of a substantial plot. The area is well vegetated, with mature hedging and trees along the boundaries. While only constructed towards the

end of the last century, the dwelling is in a fairly traditional style, which clearly plays homage to the historic character of the area.

Relevant History

H13-0291-89 - Full. Erection of single dwelling with detached garage block. Approved 23/10/89.

H13-0847-90 - Full. Erection of 4 no entrance piers. Approved 30/08/90.

H13-0263-91 - Full. Erection of garden store. Approved 12/06/91.

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:

South Holland Internal Drainage Board

Initial comments, received 11/04/25:

Outline that consent may be required as works are within 9 metres of an Internal Drainage Board controlled asset

Additional comments, received 16/07/25

"The Board do not have any further comments to make. Our comments submitted on 11/04/2025 remain valid."

Conservation Officer, Tree Preservation

"Consider whether proposed photovoltaic panels will suffer any shading from adjacent trees before approval. Shading of newly installed panels by existing protected trees is rarely a justification for height reduction"

Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority

Initial comments received 28/04/25

"Recommendation: Approve with conditions
The proposal is for extension, garage conversion to provide living accommodation, demolition of existing outbuilding, erection of new outbuilding, removal of one site access & new boundary treatments including fencing and it does not have an impact on the Public Highway or Surface Water Flood Risk.
As Lead Local Flood Authority, Lincolnshire County Council is required to provide a statutory planning consultation response regarding drainage and surface water flood risk on all Major applications. This application is classified as a Minor Application, and it is therefore the duty of the Local Planning Authority to consider the surface water flood risk and drainage proposals for this planning application.
Highway Condition 12
Within seven days of the existing access being brought into use, the other existing access onto Church Lane shall be permanently closed in accordance with details to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To reduce to a minimum, the number of individual access points to the dwelling, in the interests of road safety.
Note to planner
Please ensure that the proposed gates are set back at least 5.0 metres from the nearside carriageway edge to ensure calling vehicles can manoeuvre off the highway without causing an obstruction to other highway users when opening/closing the gates, in the interests of highway safety."

Further comments received 11/07/25

"Lincolnshire County Council as a Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority have no objection to Amendment 1 - Amendment to reduce link & rear extension to single storey with part pitched roof and part flat roof, first floor internal layout revised regarding this application"

Conservation Officer

No objections

National Grid

No observations

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 a 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, 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

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.

Paragraph 3.3.3 of the SELLP, found within the reasoned justification for Policy 2, states it is "important that any extension is carefully designed to respect and relate to the original building and integrates sensitively with the character and appearance of the surrounding area."

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.

Whilst render is not currently present on the site, the use proposed here is considered appropriate to differentiate the extended elements. The contrast between the more traditional brickwork of the host and the more contemporary render creates a greater degree of subordinacy in the extension by identifying them as additional elements. Furthermore, the render breaks up the visual mass of the building, which reduces the visual impact of linking the garage to the host.

The proposal would increase the floor space of the dwelling by a relatively significant level. That being said, much of this floor space comes from the garage conversion, which itself could reasonably occur outside of the control of the Planning Authority. The extensions themselves are well proportioned to the host dwelling. The single storey nature, would create a clear visual subservience, meaning that, despite the increase in floor area, there is a clear host vs extension relationship created. This preserves the visual integrity of the host dwelling to a greater extent.

In any event, it should be noted that only the link extension would be immediately visible from the public realm. The orientation of the dwelling, along with the existing and proposed boundary treatments, would obscure most views of the rear and side elements. As such, the tangible impacts of the development upon the character of the area are limited.

Turning to the proposed outbuilding, it is considered that the potential character impact is low. The proposed building is sufficiently well obscured and positioned sufficiently far back from the road to reduce its visibility. This lack of visibility ensures no significant harm would be created.

The proposed boundary treatments create a greater sense of enclosure within the plot. Furthermore, the extensive use of close board fencing would have a fairly harsh finish, diminishing the existing openness whilst making the plot feel far smaller. That being said, much of the fencing could be installed under the provisions of the General Permitted Development Order and/or would be obscured by the existing hedges and trees.

Taking account of the design, scale, and nature of the development, as detailed above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable. The proposal would not cause an adverse impact to the character and appearance of the area and would therefore be consistent with Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impacts Upon Resident 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.

Due to the significant distance between the dwellinghouse and the boundaries, coupled with the significant boundary treatments in situ, it is not considered that the works would result in any additional overshadowing.

The proposed rear and link extensions, as well as the conversion, would not result in additional overlooking. Boundary treatments and distances to boundaries are sufficiently large as to reduce any potential harmful views. Similarly, the proposed balcony is located approximately 30m to the southern boundary, with large trees in between. This should be sufficient to prevent harmful overlooking.

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.

Ample space has been maintained for parking on the site. There is also ample space to manoeuvre vehicles, enabling them to turn round and use the single exit/ entrance. Suitable space has been provided between the roadway and the gates, as requested by the Highway Authority.

The Highway Authority have requested a condition be imposed requiring the redundant access to be permanently closed in accordance with details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. It is considered appropriate to honour this request.

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.

Impacts of Climate Change

In respect of the climate emergency, Section 14 of the NPPF states that new development should be planned for in ways that: "avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change" with care taken to ensure that, where development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, "risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through incorporating green infrastructure and sustainable drainage systems; and help to reduce

greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design".

Paragraph 166 of the NPPF details that when determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should "expect new development to: a) comply with any development plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable; and b) take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption", with 'significant weight' given to "the need to support energy efficiency and low carbon heating improvements to existing buildings, both domestic and non-domestic (including through installation of heat pumps and solar panels where these do not already benefit from permitted development rights)".

Policy 31 of the SELLP concerns "Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy". Part B concerns renewable energy provisions, and as such, is relevant here due to the incorporation of solar panels. Policy 31 states: "With the exception of Wind Energy the development of renewable energy facilities, associated infrastructure and the integration of decentralised technologies on existing or proposed structures will be permitted provided, individually, or cumulatively, there would be no significant harm to:
1. visual amenity, landscape character or quality, or skyscape considerations;
2. residential amenity in respect of: noise, fumes, odour, vibration, shadow flicker, sunlight reflection, broadcast interference, traffic;
3. highway safety (including public rights of way);
4. agricultural land take;
5. aviation and radar safety;
6. heritage assets including their setting; and
7. the natural environment."

Assessing the proposal against these factors, it is not considered that the panels would impact upon residential amenity or highway safety. As the works would be located on a domestic roof, there would be no impact upon the natural environment or agricultural land take. There would be no impact upon aviation.

While solar panels would generally not be permissible within the Conservation Area, those proposed here would be well obscured from the public realm, only being visible from oblique angles or within the plot itself. As such, the level of harm from the panels themselves is reduced significantly. The panels may be visible from the Vicarage (the southern neighbour); however, as this is not a historic asset, no harm is considered to occur. In any event, the level of screening is so significant as to minimise views to a significant extent.

Accordingly, it is considered that, despite the historic sensitivity of the area, the proposed photovoltaic panels would not have an adverse impact upon any heritage assets or the Conservation Area.

Biodiversity & Ecology

Section 15 of the NPPF seeks to protect sites of biodiversity value, and minimise and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures, including the need to incorporate features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs.

Paragraph 193 of the NPPF details that Local Planning Authorities should apply the following principles:
"a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and
d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate".

It has been noted by the Tree Conservation Officer that the installation of solar panels is not justification for the lopping or removal of trees. This point is noted; however, it is not considered reasonable to extend further protection than is currently in place for these trees, which are offered some protection via their placement in the Conservation Area.

It should be noted at this time that as a householder development, the proposal is exempt from the standard biodiversity gain condition under Part 5 of The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024.

Heritage and Conservation

Policy 29 of the SELLP, alongside Section 16 of the NPPF, relates to the preservation of the historic environment. Both outline that all applications within the Conservation Area should preserve or enhance the setting.

In this regard, in respect of any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, through Section 72 the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

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".

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, including archaeology, historic buildings, conservation areas, scheduled monuments, street patterns, streetscapes, landscapes, parks (including Registered Parks and Gardens), river frontages, structures and their settings through high-quality sensitive design.

It is considered that the proposal would introduce increasingly modern elements into the Conservation Area. That being said, development within the Conservation Area should not simply be a pastiche of perceived historic styles and appropriate modern elements can be beneficial to the overall appreciation of a Conservation Area. To this end, in utilising a more modern design, the proposal highlights positive elements of the Conservation Area, via the creation of contrast.

In any event, it should be noted that only the proposed link extension would be reasonably visible from the public realm. It is considered that this element is so diminutive in scale as to have a comparatively low impact upon the wider Conservation Area. Furthermore, the use of render within this element breaks up the visual massing of the building, preventing the resultant dwelling from appearing unduly dominant and imposing within the Conservation Area.

To this end, it is considered that, while the proposal would have more modern design approach than the host dwelling, no harm to the Conservation Area would occur.

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 proposal represents appropriate development within the defined settlement boundary. The development hereby proposed does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or amenity of nearby residents, and provides adequate parking, whilst conforming with the SELLP

and the provisions of the NPPF when viewed as a whole.

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 comply with Policies 1, 2, 3, 28, 29, 31, 33, 36 and Appendix 6 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 2, 9, 12, 14, 15 and 16 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the benefits of the proposal; therefore, the planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

Recommendation

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