DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H16-0332-25**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs P Ingleby**
Proposal:	Proposed extensions and alterations to dwelling and outbuilding		
Location:	14 Halmer Paddock Spalding Lincolnshire		
Terminal Date:	1st August 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
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
Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	1	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a householder application, seeking permission for a series of extensions and alterations to 14 Halmer Paddock, Spalding. The extensions can be split into three components, a northern side extension, a southern side extension and a rear extension. It is also proposed that an existing open garage would be enclosed.

The north side extension would project from an existing rear single storey component towards Halmer Paddock. The extension would measure 2408mm (width) by 7341mm(depth). The extension would have a dual pitched roof, with an eaves height of 3136mm and a ridge height of 4396mm. To enable the dual pitched roof, the roof would be incorporated into the existing single storey element. It is proposed that the extension would be constructed of brickwork to match the host, with detailing along the eaves.

The rear extension would run along width of the property, between the existing single storey element and the garage. The extension would measure 7806mm (width) by 4000mm (depth). It would feature a flat roof set at 3243mm. The extension would be clad in timber. A roof lantern is proposed.

Projecting from the rear extension and the garage would be the southern side extension. The extension would measure approximately 3750mm by 4220mm. It would also feature a flat roof, although in a staggered form to provide an overhang, set at 3243mm. The extension would feature a heavy use of glass work.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Spalding as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The dwelling is within a distinctly residential area to the east of the settlement. The site within a corner plot, at the junction of Queens Road and Halmer Paddock.

The existing dwelling is a reasonably sized, red-brick dwelling. It features cream window frames, with two bay windows to the front. A single storey mono-pitch roof is present to the rear. A two-storey outbuilding, with open garage, is also located to the rear.

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

Request additional information:

"Parking and turning needs to be demonstrated on the proposed block plan."

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 Spalding which is classed as a sub-regional centre within Policy 1. As such development will be permitted that supports Spalding'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 Spalding, 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, 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.

The provisions of the National Design Guide (NDG) should also be taken into account here. Paragraph 53 outlines broadly that "Well-designed new development is influenced by: an appreciation and understanding of vernacular, local or regional character, including existing built form, landscape and local architectural precedents; the characteristics of the existing built form" amongst other matters such as scale of buildings and existing relationships between elements. Paragraph 56 expands upon this, stating that "Well-designed places contribute to local distinctiveness. This may include: adopting typical building forms, composition, articulation, proportions, features, materials, details, patterns and colours of an area; drawing upon the architectural precedents that are prevalent in the local area, including the proportions of buildings and their openings".

The proposed extensions would notably increase the scale of the dwelling. The connection to the outbuilding would result in the building seeming even larger. It is considered that the resultant footprint of the dwelling would be significantly greater than its counterparts in the immediate area, resulting in a dwelling appearing out of keeping with the built form of the area.

The proposed north side extension, which projects towards the junction of the relevant roads, would be highly visible from the roadside. The result of the extension would be to create an unorthodox impression of the building, which increases the visual mass of the dwelling. As the extension is towards a corner plot, which controls significant views into and from the cul-de-sac, and is immediately adjacent to the site's boundary, it would create a greater sense of enclosure, increase the relative scale of the building, and harm the openness of the area. The effect is an overly dominant and prominent form of development. Furthermore, the extension's position so close to a visible boundary would greatly increase the perceived mass of the building, relative to its plot, which may result in the dwelling appearing overly large in its setting. The effect would also be to create an unorthodox form within this corner, which fails to suitably relate to the prevailing built form of the area. These impacts are further exacerbated given that the existing built form of the host dwelling already projects beyond the established linear form of Halmer Paddock, with the extensions increasing this further.

While the southern side extension would be reasonably well obscured by existing boundary treatments, it is considered that it too would have a harmful effect. The choice of material, modern design philosophy and flat roof fail to properly integrate with the host dwelling. As a result, the extension would appear as an unnatural and poorly integrated addition, thus failing to achieve the requirements of Paragraph 3.3.3 of the SELLP. As this extension would be visible from the principal elevation the impacts of the development would be increased.

Again, the use of a more modern design philosophy and choice of material for the rear component is considered to relate poorly to the host dwelling. The corner plot location and openness of Halmer Paddock means that the extension would still be highly prominent, despite its rear location, therefore, creating a degree of harm.

The extensions would result in a link being formed to the two-storey garage/ outbuilding. The result of this is to further integrate the outbuilding with the host building from a visual and functional perspective. From a visual standpoint, it is such that the footprint and mass of the outbuilding would be less distinctive from the host, so that the two may be considered as one unit to a greater extent than is currently the case. As such, the cumulative effect of the extensions and the incorporation of the garage is such as to create a dwelling which appears overly large for its plot and out of proportion with its counterparts in the immediate area.

The provisions of the NDG are such, that "where the character of an existing place has limited or

few positive qualities, then a new and positive character will enhance its identity". It is not considered that the proposal would create a new positive identity. Instead in failing to accord to the provisions of Paragraphs 53 and 56, in respect to rooting to design in the character of the area, the proposal is considered to be detrimental to the character of the area.

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 to the character or 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 positioning of windows is such as to prevent significant overlooking as a result of the development. Their position on the ground floor ensures any views would be obscured by existing boundary treatments.

Turning to overshadowing, while the extensions are relatively large, it is not considered that they would cast shadow upon neighbouring plots. Ample distance has been maintained to the east to ensure this.

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 is not considered to have a severe adverse impact upon the highway network. Adequate space has been maintained to ensure vehicles can still properly access and leave the site. Parking provisions have still been provided.

The request for additional information by the Highway Authority is noted; however, it is considered unnecessary to request this information, due to the Case Officers assessment of site conditions in relation to parking. Furthermore, seeing as character harm has been identified as a result of the proposed works, it would unreasonable to request an amendment when the application is still to likely to be refused.

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 Zones 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 all, with a hazard depth of 2 metres. That being said, in line with Footnote 62 and Paragraph 176 of the NPPF, there is no need to apply the sequential test or exception test in this instance.

While the risk of flooding on the site is significant, the proposed extension would not exacerbate this. The extension would be no more at risk of flooding than the host property and would make the host property no more vulnerable than it currently is. As such, it would be entirely inappropriate to resist the proposal on this basis.

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 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 built form of the area. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the provisions of Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP, Section 12 of the NPPF and the NDG.

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." As such, significant weight is given against the proposal.

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 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.