

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H14-0219-25 **Applicant:** Ms Y Liu

Proposal: Demolition of single storey rear extension & erection of single storey rear extension & alterations

Location: Whitebeams 1 Money Bridge Lane West Pinchbeck

Terminal Date: 29th April 2025

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01 Spatial Strategy

02 Development Management

03 Design of New Development

04 Approach to Flood Risk

36 Vehicle and Cycle Parking

APPENDIX 6 Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
 Section 4 - Decision-making
 Section 11 - Making effective use of land
 Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
 Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

National Guidance

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

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of a single storey rear extension and the erection of a single storey rear extension and other external alterations. The submitted plans show that timber weather boarding is proposed on the external facades of the bungalow to replace the existing red brickwork facades.

Site Description

The site comprises land at Whitebeams, 1 Money Bridge Lane, West Pinchbeck. The site features a detached single storey bungalow with a hipped roof form. There is an existing single storey extension which is located to the rear and side of the dwelling and the extension features a flat roof form.

The site is located outside of any defined settlement limit, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, and the accompanying policies map.

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

Relevant Planning History

H14-0260-91: (Full Application) Siting of mobile home - approved 29 May 1991

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the consultation period are summarised below. The responses can be viewed in their entirety on South Holland District Council's website.

Pinchbeck Parish Council: Pinchbeck Parish Council supports planning application H14-0219-25, as it enhances local amenity and is consistent with sustainable development objectives.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: The parking and turning should be detailed on the block plan.

Cllr S A Slade: No response received.

Cllr J Avery: No response received.

Cllr E J Sneath: No response received.

Public Representations

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, no letters of representation have been received.

Key Planning Considerations

Development Plan

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, December 2024

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

There are no adopted Neighbourhood Plans for the area within which the site is located.

The main issues and considerations in this case include the following:

- Principle of Development;
- Design and Visual Impact; and
- Impact on Amenity.

These matters are assessed in turn below.

Principle of Development

Policy 1 of the Local Plan sets out the settlement hierarchy in respect of delivering sustainable development, which meets the social and economic needs of the area whilst protecting and enhancing the environment; in order to provide enough choice of land for housing to satisfy local need, whilst making more sustainable use of land, and to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural plots by developing in sustainable locations and at appropriate densities.

Policy 1 expresses this sustainable hierarchy of settlements, ranking the settlements deemed to be most sustainable in descending order. The most sustainable locations for development are situated within the 'Sub-Regional Centres', followed by 'Main Service Centres'. Lower down the hierarchy are areas of limited development opportunity including Minor Service Centres, with areas of development constraint comprising 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. The countryside is at the bottom of the settlement hierarchy and represents the least sustainable location.

Whilst, the site is outside of any defined settlement and is therefore within the countryside in planning policy terms, the proposal solely relates to the extension of an existing dwelling. Therefore, the principle of such development is appropriate. This is however subject to assessing the proposals against other relevant material considerations.

Design and Visual Impact

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

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

Policy 3 accords with the provisions of Section 12 of the NPPF, in that it requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically-designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

The existing dwelling comprises a detached bungalow with a hipped roof form. The dwelling is set within a spacious plot and there is generous screening of the site in terms of existing vegetation including hedgerows and trees. The site is not particularly visible from Fengate Road to the south due to the positioning of existing dwellings to the south of the site and a tree line that provides screening of the site. The nearest dwelling to the north of the site Mole End, which is also a single storey bungalow. To the south, there is a row of bungalows including Cross Roads, St Brelades and Sandy Lodge.

The existing extension is located to the side and rear of the main dwelling. The existing extension measures 6.5m in width and 6m in length. The proposed extension measures 6.4m in width initially and then this widens to 6.9m. The proposed extension measures 12.3m in length. The extension would feature two sections. The section which is located towards the front of the extension features a gable end roof form and a flat roof which is mostly located behind the main dwelling. The other section features a gable end roof form which measures 5.3m in height up to the proposed ridgeline. The main dwelling measures 6m up to its ridgeline. As such, the proposed extension would not be as tall as the main dwelling.

The main dwelling features a hipped roof form, which would therefore contrast with the gable end and flat roof forms on the extension. The extension would however be subservient to the main dwelling due to its position towards the rear of the dwelling and due to its overall scale. The extension would also be relatively screened from the surrounding area by an established tree belt and area of vegetation which is located to the south. It is therefore considered that the proposed scale, siting and appearance of the extension is acceptable overall.

The submitted plans indicate that the external walls of the existing bungalow are proposed to be clad with timber weatherboarding. The dwelling currently features red brickwork. The proposed extension is proposed to feature 'brickwork'. The proposed colour and brick type are not indicated. Similarly, the proposed roof tiles are merely set out as 'plain tiles'. The contrast of weatherboarding on the main dwelling and brickwork on the extension might be acceptable as the two materials can complement one another. Furthermore, the proposed extension is set back towards the rear of the dwelling, reducing its visual prominence within the street scene. It is however considered necessary to secure further details of the proposed materials through a condition in order to ensure that the proposed materials are of a suitable quality and appearance.

The visual impact of the proposed development is therefore acceptable. The proposed development would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area and would therefore accord with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that development should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

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

There are suitable separation distances between the extension and the nearest dwellings. The proposed extension would therefore not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing or overlooking. Therefore, the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of neighbouring properties and future occupants would be acceptable. As such, the proposed development accords with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Other Matters

Lincolnshire County Council's highways team have requested that the parking arrangements and turning area should be set out on the proposed site plan. The proposed extension would not alter the parking requirements for the site and there is sufficient room for parking within the front driveway of the site. This is demonstrated within an updated version of the site plan that has been submitted for clarity.

The red line boundary has also been reduced during the determination of the application to exclude the southern part of the site. The amended red line boundary is considered to be more suitable as a likely area for the residential curtilage of the dwelling.

The site is within Flood Zone 3. The site is located within a low hazard rating area, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. As the proposal is for a single storey rear extension, no specific flood risk mitigation is required in this instance.

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 amenity of nearby residents. The proposed development therefore accords with the Local Plan and the NPPF. 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 and 4 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.