DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No:** | **H14-0827-26** | **Applicant:** | **J D Williams** |
| **Proposal:** | Proposed double storey side and rear extensions and demolition of front hip end element | | |
| **Location:** | Milestone Nurseries Herdgate Lane Pinchbeck | | |
| **Terminal Date:** | 27th October 2026 | | |

## Planning Policies

**South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019**

| | |
|---|---|
| 01 | Spatial Strategy |
| 02 | Development Management |
| 03 | Design of New Development |
| 04 | Approach to Flood Risk |
| 33 | Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network |
| 36 | Vehicle and Cycle Parking |
| APPENDIX 6 | Parking Standards |

**National Guidance**

**National Planning Policy Framework August 2026**

Section 4 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 14 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 15 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 17 - Pollution, public protection and security
Section 18 - Managing flood risk and coastal change

## 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 and a rear extension, as well as wider alterations at Milestone Nurseries, Herdgate Lane.

The existing house would be reskinned in reclaimed brickwork, to match the proposed extension, with several elements, including the first floor bay window, being removed. A new gable ended roof is proposed, with this roof tying into the proposed western extension. This western extension would measure approximately 4.348m (width) by 8.445m (depth). To enable the western extension, the existing garage would be removed. The effect of this extension and the alterations to the principle elevation is a dwellinghouse of a vastly different style, more reminiscent of an Edwardian double-bay windowed property.

The rear extension would project from the east of the dwelling. It would measure 3.466m (depth) by 7.7m (width). It would feature a gable ended roof, running perpendicular to the host, set at 5.329m (eaves height), rising to 8.2m (ridge height).

The cumulative effect of the changes would be a dwelling measuring approximately 12m (width) by 12m (depth) at its deepest and widest. This produces a floor area of approximately 226sqm, and a footprint of 132sqmm. A new slate roof is proposed. White UPVC doors and windows are proposed.

### Site Description

The site is outside of the settlement boundaries outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, sitting approximately 10m north of the edge of Pinchbeck. Despite being close to the settlement, the area has a rural character.

The existing dwelling is a modest, three-bedroom dwelling. It measures 7.7m (width) by 12m (depth), with a maximum eaves and ridge height of 5.4m and 7.8m respectively. This gives a floor area of 110sqm and a footprint of 71sqm. A small brick built garage with footprint 17.7sqm is located to the west.

### Relevant History

H14-1145-07 - Full - Proposed extension to existing dwelling - Refused 08/10/07. Appeal dismissed 25/03/08.

H14-0125-26 - Full - Proposed double storey side and rear extensions and demolition of front hip end element - Refused 24/03/26

### 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 proposed double storey side and rear extensions and demolition of front hip end element, 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

Support - The Parish Council supports application H14-0827-26, considering the proposed two-storey side and rear extensions and front alterations at Milestone Nurseries sympathetic to the existing building and the character of the surrounding area

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, 2026 (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 lies outside of any of the settlement boundaries defined within the SELLP. The site can therefore be judged to be outside of a defined settlement, and in the countryside for the purposes of planning.

Policy S5 of the NPPF states that only certain forms of development should be approved outside settlements, with these forms of development being defined within subsequent paragraphs. S5(1C) states that this includes "the reuse, extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building, provided that the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction, is lawful in planning terms, and any extension or alteration will not result in a disproportionate increase in size compared to the existing building".

Footnote 25 clarifies that "The existing building is to be assessed as the property as existing on the date of the publication of this Framework".

The building is lawful in planning terms, and is of a substantial construction. The works would result in an increase in footprint from approximately 71sqm to 132sqm, which is an approximate increase of 86%. When the garage to be removed is considered in addition, which would not necessarily be required under the strictest reading of Policy S5, the increase is still 60%. The increase in floor area of the dwelling, not including the garage, is from approximately 110sqm to approximately 226sqm. This is an approximate 105% increase .It should be noted at this stage the wording of S5 relates solely to the existing building, and not wider considerations such as the plot it sits within.

No definition of disproportionate is provided within the NPPF. However, in this instance, it is considered that the proposal would constitute a disproportionate extension. Regardless of whether the garage is considered within the calculations or otherwise, a minimum increase in footprint of 60% would occur. This is far larger than would be expected under a typical extension. Likewise, the floor area would double as a result of the works.

As such, it is considered that the proposal would represent a disproportionate extension in the countryside, which would therefore be contrary to Policy S5 of the NPPF.

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

Section 14 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", outlines that planning decisions and policies should "promote high quality, healthy, inclusive and sustainable places".

Paragraph 1 of DP3 outlines that "development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets".

In order to create well-designed places, Paragraph 2 outlines that proposals should reflect seven key principles, as appropriate to the nature of the development and its location. These are: liveability, climate, nature, movement, built form, public space, and identity.

Paragraph 3 of DP3 is explicit that proposals which conflict with paragraph 1, the relevant aspects of paragraph 2 of DP3, or relevant development plan policies and guidance, should be refused. Conversely, substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.

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, within the reasoned justification for Policy 2, states that 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 it is accepted that the plot is large, and is capable of accepting appropriate further development, as previously outlined, the scale of the extension is considered to be disproportionate to the host dwelling. The extensions are transformative, and do not relate to the existing scales of the dwelling, nor comprise a proportionate or subordinate enlargement, and as such they fail to respect the existing character or proportions of the dwellinghouse. The proposal also includes an increase in height, which itself further enlarges the overall extent of development on site. The effect of the extensions is a dwelling which bears little to no resemblance to the existing building. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the provisions of Paragraph 3.3.3 of the SELLP.

The proposal would result in a dwelling which bears little resemblance to the existing property. It has been outlined that inspiration has been drawn from Victorian properties. The bay windows, proportions of the dwelling, and design would appear to be reminiscent of an Edwardian town house (although this design would have been present in the late Victorian period also). The design proposed appears to be a pastiche of these Edwardian properties, which are typical within urban areas, and are less associated with rural housing or farm housing of the same period.

The site is close to the settlement of Pinchbeck, but is beyond the defined settlement and there is clear "end point" of the built form of the settlement prior to the site. This results in a distinctly rural/ peri-rural setting along Herdgate Lane. As a result, the more urban design inspiration, and the pastiche of urban form, would be inappropriate in this setting.

Several examples of other similar dwellings in the area have been provided. Bar the dwelling along White Cross Lane, which appears to be a more modern dwellinghouse itself, these dwellings are all within the defined settlement, and as a result display vastly different constraints and design pressures. These dwellings are not within the immediate vicinity of the application site, and so their ability to naturalise the design proposed is limited. Those dwellings referenced to the north are of more modern construction, and their attempts to replicate Edwardian architecture is limited.

Moreover, the design of these dwellings bear little resemblance to the design proposed here, and it is not considered that these existing dwellings would naturalise the proposal.

Whilst taken in isolation of its setting and the existing dwelling, the proposal may sit well in its plot, and may display several attractive features, it is not considered appropriate to view the site in such isolation. The NPPF is clear that designs should take due credence of the existing built form of an area; and therefore, it is considered that the proposal fails to reflect the principles of design outlined in Policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Taking account of the design, scale, and nature of the development, as detailed above, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable. The proposal would have 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 14 of the NPPF.

Impacts Upon Resident Amenity

DP3 of the NPPF outlines that development should create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a focus on promoting liveability.

Likewise, Policy P3(1) outlines that development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site. This point is expanded upon in P3(2) which states all development proposals should "provide healthy living conditions for occupiers and users in terms of adequate access to light and avoiding exposure to levels of air, noise, artificial light or other sources of pollution which could have an unacceptable adverse effect on health and the quality of life ".

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 to neighbouring properties, it is not considered that there would be an overshadowing effect. The site is remote enough as to prevent overlooking, with all views resulting from the works facing agricultural fields/the public realm.

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 Sections 14 and 17 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan in terms of impact upon residential amenity.

Highway Safety and Parking

Section 15 of the NPPF is titled 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Within this, Policy TR6(4) advises that "development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety; taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement. This applies both during the construction phase and following completion."

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. Adequate parking has been maintained on the site.

While the proposal would increase the intensity of the use, the existing access would still be servable.

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 15 of the NPPF.

Flooding Considerations

Section 18 of the NPPF relates to "Managing flood risk and coastal change". It requires a sequential approach to flood risk, in accordance with the decision making policies contained within this section. Policy F7 is clear that "development proposals should not present a risk from flooding to potential occupiers, users, or visitors, and should not increase flood risk elsewhere."

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.

NPPF Policy F5(3) states "the strategic flood risk assessment covering the area of the proposed development and the Flood Map for Planning should provide the evidential basis for applying the sequential test". 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 0.25m.

Whilst the onsite flood risk is noted, Policy F5(2) states:
"The sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, other than for - householder development".
Expanding upon this, NPPF Policy F6(2) states: "The exception test does not need to be applied: To those forms of development, or in those circumstances, where the sequential test is not required, as set out in policy F5"

Therefore, in line with Policy F5(2)(ci) and F6(2)(a), there is no need to apply the exceptions or sequential tests. In any event, the proposal would not increase the vulnerability of the use to flooding, or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

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.

The proposal is considered to be disproportionally large in comparison to the existing dwelling. The proposed extensions are considered to lack proper integration into the host dwelling or the wider area. The extensions would appear overly large and incongruous with the existing character of the area.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the provisions of Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP, Sections 4 and 14 of the NPPF and the National Design Guide.

## 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 be contrary to Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 4 and 14 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.