

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H15-0213-26 **Applicant:** Mr P Macmanaman

Proposal: Proposed two storey extension to house and proposed rendering of the dwelling

Location: 90 Main Road Quadring Spalding

Terminal Date: 5th June 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
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

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

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a two-storey extension and the proposed rendering of the dwelling.

Initially, the description of development only referenced the proposed extension. The submitted plans indicated that the extension was proposed to feature rendered facades. This was discussed with the applicant's agent as the existing dwelling features red brickwork facades and as such, it was suggested that the extension should feature matching materials to help integrate the extension with the existing dwelling. The applicant's agent then set out that the proposal is for both the extension and the existing dwelling to be rendered; however, this was not set out within the application form, the description of development or within the submitted plans.

As such, it was agreed to update the description of development to refer to the proposed rendering of the dwelling and to update one of the relevant plans to clarify that the proposal seeks to render the dwelling as a whole.

Site Description

The application site comprises 90 Main Road in Quadring which is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling featuring a hipped roof form.

The site is within the settlement limits of Quadring, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (March 2019) and the accompanying policies map.

The site is mostly within Flood Zone 1, as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps. Some of the rear part of the site is within Flood Zone 2. The area where the extension is proposed is within Flood Zone 1.

Relevant Planning History

No applications have previously been submitted within the site.

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.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: No objections. It is considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Quadring Parish Council: No response received.

CLlr H J W Bingham: No response received.

CLlr M A Geaney: No response received.

CLlr J L King: 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 representations have been received from members of the public.

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:

- Visual and Amenity Impact; and
- Biodiversity Net Gain.

These matters are assessed in turn below.

Visual and Amenity 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. Paragraph 135 also 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.

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.

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.

The existing dwelling comprises a semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof form. The dwelling faces towards Main Road which is located to the north-east of the site. There is a single storey flat roofed side extension on the north-western side of the dwelling. The proposal seeks to replace this structure with the proposed two-storey extension. The dwelling currently features red brickwork facades.

The nearest dwellings to the site comprise similar semi-detached dwellings with hipped roof forms. The surrounding dwellings are relatively similar on both sides of Main Road in terms of their overall scale and plot sizes. On the southern side of Main Road, where the site is located, the dwellings are set back from the road frontage at different distances. The dwellings also feature a mixture of render and red brickwork facades.

The extension is proposed on the north-western side of the dwelling. A hipped roof form is proposed, for which the ridgeline would be lower than the main part of the dwelling. For example, the ridgeline of the existing dwelling measures 7.4m in height whereas the extension would measure 7.1m in height. The eaves would be set at the same level as the eaves on the main dwelling.

The side extension would measure 2.3m in width towards the front of the site whereas the current extension measures approximately 3.3m in width. Therefore, the extension would not be as wide; however, the extension would be much taller. The front part of the extension would also be closer to the front elevation of the dwelling than the existing side extension. The extension would still be set back further to the rear than the principal elevation of the dwelling, as is the case for the current side extension.

The extension would measure 9.5m in length from the front to the back and it is considered that the extension would be relatively large compared to the existing dwelling. It is noted that there is a similar sized extension located at 82 Main Road which is located to the east of the site. Therefore, there is a nearby comparable extension. Furthermore, most of the bulk of the extension would be located towards the rear of the site and views of this part of the dwelling would partly be screened by 92 Main Road when viewed from the street scene.

The nearest dwellings to the site include 92 Main Road which is to the west of the site, and 88 Main Road which is located to the east of the site. 88 Main Road is attached to the host dwelling within the site. Due to the scale and positioning of the extension, it is considered that the proposals would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of the nearest dwellings. For example, even though the extension would feature two storeys and project to the rear of the site, the extension is not expected to result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing as the extension is positioned at a sufficient distance and angle from the nearest windows on the neighbouring dwellings. This is based on a review of the plans that have been provided and a review of the planning documents that were approved under application H15-0889-93 for a rear extension at 92 Main Road.

A window is proposed at the first-floor level on the north-western side elevation which connects to a bathroom. Although this window would not face directly towards any neighbouring habitable windows, the window would face towards 92 Main Road. Therefore, it would be considered appropriate to require obscure glazing for this window in the interests of maintaining privacy. A ground floor window is also proposed on the side elevation; however, this would connect to a utility room and as this would not be considered as a habitable room, obscure glazing for this window would not be considered as necessary.

Initially, the submitted plans indicated that the proposed extension would feature white render, and it appeared that the host dwelling would remain featuring red brickwork facades. It was considered that this would result in a disjointed appearance at the front of the site and alternative materials were requested. Furthermore, the application form referred to cream render and as such, the submitted details were inconsistent.

As set out previously, this was discussed with the applicant's agent, and it was clarified that the proposal sought to install render on both the proposed extension and the existing dwelling. As this was unclear based on the submitted information, it was agreed that the description of development should be updated to reflect this, and an amended elevation plan was provided to clarify that cream render is proposed on both the extension and the original dwelling.

Generally, it is preferable for the materials of extensions to match the host building and in this case, this would be matching red brickwork. It is unclear when the dwelling was constructed though it appears to be a few decades old and it is recognised that it can be difficult to source matching brickwork for older dwellings. Furthermore, in this case there is a mixture of red brickwork and rendered facades within the street scene. Some of the dwellings within the street scene feature a combination of both render and brickwork and the one of the nearest dwellings features rendered facades (92 Main Road). Therefore, in this case the proposed rendering of the dwelling and the extension is considered to be acceptable on balance.

Overall, it is considered that the development would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area. The development is also expected to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and future occupants. As such, the proposals accord with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021) requires developers to deliver a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain using standardized biodiversity units measured by statutory biodiversity metrics. This is often referred to as the mandatory requirements for Biodiversity Net Gain.

"Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, subject to some exceptions, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met ("the biodiversity gain condition"). This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. This increase can be achieved through onsite biodiversity gains, registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits".

The biodiversity gain condition is a pre-commencement condition. This relates to a condition that seeks, once planning permission has been granted, a Biodiversity Gain Plan that must be submitted and approved by the planning authority before commencement of the development, alongside the need to submit a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan.

The effect of Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the "biodiversity gain condition".

The effect of this "biodiversity gain condition" is that development granted by this notice must not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan, or
- (c) the development is exempt from the biodiversity gain condition.

When taking the above into account, the development in this instance the application is exempt from the statutory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirements.

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 the amenity of nearby residents. It is considered that the proposed development 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 and 3 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.