DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H14-0195-26**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs Fletcher-Smith**
Proposal:	Proposed Two Storey Extension to include Replacement Garage and Rendering of Existing Dwelling		
Location:	15 Six House Bank West Pinchbeck Spalding		
Terminal Date:	28th April 2026		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
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

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a householder application for the erection of a two storey, side extension, which would replace an existing garage, and the rendering of the existing dwelling. The extension would measure 5.8m (width) by 6.85m (depth) and would be on the site of an existing single storey attached garage. To the eaves, the height would measure approximately 5.2m, rising to 7.7m at its apex. Both heights are consistent with the host.

An overhanging roof is proposed along the front of the dwelling with a depth of 0.6m. A small wooden, open sided porch is also proposed. As a part of the works proposed, the extension and whole dwelling would be rendered.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Northgate outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The dwelling is located towards the junction of Six House Bank, a long linear strip of residential development, and the cul-de-sac Rural Avenue. The area is characterised by residential dwellings, of various ages, scales and designs.

15 Six House Bank is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. It is constructed of red-brick with a pantile roof.

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

This proposal is for a two storey extension to include replacement garage 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

Pinchbeck Parish Council

The proposed two- storey extension, replacement garage and rendering are considered appropriate for the site and in keeping with the existing street scene

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 Northgate which is classed as an "other service centre" within Policy 1. As such development will be permitted that supports Northgate'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 Northgate, 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.

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.

There is no clear consistency of materials in the area, with render and brick both being common, although red bricks are the most common material in the immediate area. The addition of render would break the consistency with the adjoining dwelling. This would create an unusual contrast, to the detriment of the appearance of the area. Whilst it is accepted a comparable effect could be

achieved via painting, this effect would be far less pronounced and there would still be a degree of consistency in the tactility of the material. On this basis, whilst render is not an uncommon material, its application on a semi-detached dwelling, where the partner is red brick, would be atypical and create an awkward contrast.

There is a mix of scales of dwellings in the area, although, generally, there is a preference for small to medium sized dwellings. Footprints are generally below 100sqm. Dwellings are not sprawling within their plots; they are generally located centrally and display good separation distances. This creates a perception of lower density housing. Contrary to this, the proposed extension would run close to the boundary line, at only 0.9m distance to the boundary at its closest. Whilst it is appreciated this footprint is comparable to the garage, the two-storey nature of the development makes the impact more pronounced and exacerbates the perception of overdevelopment. The extension would result in a dwelling appearing overly large for its setting and plot.

The two-storey nature of the extension would appear overly large in this setting, resulting in a dwelling which breaks the established norms of the area. The proposed render and lack of distance to neighbouring plots furthers this sense of atypicality. The proposal would therefore fail to respect the existing character of the area, as outlined in the National Design Guide, and would be contrary to Paragraph 139 of the NPPF as a result.

Taking account of the design, scale, and nature of the development, as detailed above, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable. The proposal would cause an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and would therefore be contrary to 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.

The separation distance shown is minimal. The two-storey nature of the development means there would be some degree of overshadowing on the garden of 3 Rural Avenue. Whilst this may worsen the enjoyment of the garden, it is not considered that the scale of overshadowing would be so significant as to be considered contrary to the Local Plan in this regard. Only a relatively small area of garden would be effected and no windows would be impacted.

The rear first floor windows would offer clear and unobstructed views into the garden of 3 Rural Avenue. However, as both windows connect onto an ensuite, it would not be unreasonable to condition these windows to be obscure glazed. This would prevent a harmful amenity impact.

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.

The proposal would result in an additional bedroom, necessitating an additional parking space. Ample room has been maintained in the plot to enable this.

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.

Flooding Considerations

Section 14 of the NPPF requires development plans to "apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development - taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change - so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property. They should do this, and manage any residual risk, by: (...) applying the sequential test and then, if necessary, the exception test as set out below".

Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states "the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding". The strategic flood risk assessment provides the basis for applying this test.

Paragraph 175 of the NPPF states that "the sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, except in situations where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates that no built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future (having regard to potential changes in flood risk)."

If, following the application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible, consistent with wider sustainability objectives, for the development to be located in zones with a lower probability of flooding, the Exceptions Test can be applied if appropriate. The process for applying the Exception Test is outlined within Paragraphs 177, 178 and 179 of the NPPF. Paragraph 178 states "to pass the exception test it should be demonstrated that: a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall"

The site lies within Flood Zone 3 of the Environment Agency's Flood Maps. These have been created as a tool to raise awareness of flood risk with the public and partner organisations, such as Local Authorities, Emergency Services and Drainage Authorities. The Maps do not take into account any flood defences.

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. Policy 4 of the SELLP is clear in that "Development proposed within an area at risk of flooding (Flood Zones 2 and 3 of the Environment Agency's flood map or at risk during a breach or overtopping scenario as shown on the flood hazard and depths maps in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment) will be permitted" in instances where specific criteria is met.

It is worth noting that large parts of the district of South Holland lie within Flood Zone 3. It is therefore necessary to use the refined flood risk information (Hazard and Depth maps) within the SFRA as a basis to apply the sequential test.

Within the SFRA the site is classed as danger for some, with a hazard depth of up to 0.5m.

Paragraph 176 of the NPPF states: "Applications for some minor development and changes of use should also not be subject to the sequential test, nor the exception test set out below". Footnote 62 clarifies that minor development includes householder development.

As such, there is no need to apply the sequential or exceptions test here. In any event, the small scale of the proposal would ensure it does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The extension would be no more vulnerable to the impacts of flooding than the existing building.

Overall, when considering the development on balance, it is considered, given the mitigation measures detailed and recommended by condition, that the proposal accords with Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the SELLP and the intentions of the NPPF with regards to flood risk.

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.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states:
"Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes."

It is considered that the scale of the extension, its positioning to the side of the dwelling and immediately up to the boundary, and the addition of render would result in an incongruous development which fails to reflect the principles of the National Design Guide.

Therefore, in line with Section 12 of the NPPF, the application should be refused.

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 contrary to Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP, as well as Section 12 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the harm of the proposal; 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.