

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H16-0382-26 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Clark

Proposal: Proposed Two Storey Side Extension, Internal Alterations & External Transformation

Location: 2 Miles Bank Spalding

Terminal Date: 7th August 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
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a householder planning application for the erection of a two-storey side extension and wider alterations at 2 Miles Bank, Spalding.

It is proposed that the extension would project from the southern elevation. It would have a width of between 4.413m and 5.823m, with a length of 8.268m. The extension would feature a dual pitched roof, and a dormer window, set at approximately 2.6m to the eaves, rising to 6.3m at the apex. The dormer would face west, and would measure (at its widest, deepest and tallest) 1.5m, by 3.43m by 2.7m. The extension would be constructed of brick to match the host.

The extension to the principal elevation will measure 660mm (depth) by 4000mm (width) and would form a porch. The porch would be constructed of brick to match the host. Two box windows are proposed either side of the front extension. These would be brick. The first floor would be rendered white.

It is also proposed that the northern section of the principal elevation would be clad in grey. The southern section of this elevation would be rendered white, as would the whole of the southern elevation. Two Juliette balconies would be added to the rear, facing north and east.

Site Description

The site is located towards the northern boundary of Spalding, just south of Vernatt's Drain. The area is characterised by residential properties, with the dwelling being adjacent to properties to the north, south and east. To the west is a small grassy area. The residential properties in the area are of various designs, with a mixture of single and two storey dwellings. The immediate properties are modern but possess features of traditional buildings.

The property in question is a two-storey, red brick dwelling. Black bricks edge the property. To the rear is a sizeable double garage with master bedroom above. The curtilage is of significant size, with the garden being separated into two by a north to south boundary wall. The building has been constructed in a traditional style.

The dwelling to the north, 4 Miles Bank, has no windows overlooking the property. A short, wooden border-fence runs between the two houses. The eastern neighbours, 22 Chaldean Way, have one window looking onto the proposed works: a first-floor kitchen window. Again, the properties are separated by a wooden fence.

Relevant History

H16-1074-88 - Outline permission for the erection of a housing estate. Approved 5/9/88.

H16-0731-89 - Section 31A. Modification of condition 2 to allow separate submission of Reserved Matters. Approved 26/09/89.

H16-0683-93 - Full. Erect detached houses including estate roads on plots 64-66 and 72-87, Chaldean Way. Approved 28/09/93.

H16-1108-93 - Condition Compliance. Details of external materials submitted (Condition 2 of H16/0683/93). Approved 14/12/93.

H16-1109-93 - Condition Compliance. Details of type and colour of block paving - Marshalls Keyblok Buff (Condition 11 of H16/0683/93). Approved 14/12/93.

H16-0299-96 - S73A Continuation. Continuation of use without complying with landscaping maintenance condition by removal of frontage hedge. Refused 21/06/96.

H16-1191-22 - Full. Proposed single storey side and rear extensions, including changes to fenestration. Approved 20-01-23

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

No objection - Proposed two storey side extension, internal alterations & external transformation - the proposal does not change the access or parking, the proposal does not increase bedrooms so

there is no further demand for parking. Should the additional areas of bedroom 2 be changed into a 5th bedroom in the future it would not cause a hazard should an additional car have to park on the road at this location. The proposal will not have an adverse effect on the public highway

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 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.

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 proposed side extension is large and, to a certain extent, would break the existing uniformity of "build line" in the area. However, a comparable extension was approved under H16-1191-22. This permission appears to have been implemented. As it is the fundamentals of the extension which would provide the minor degree of tension with the prevailing built form, in light of this fallback position, the weight attributed to this point is reduced. In any event, the proposal would reflect the form of the dwelling, retain the existing positive features (such as the circular window) and be of a proportionate scale to the host.

Similarly, a comparable front extension was approved under H16-1191-22, and in light of this fallback position, the proposal is considered acceptable. The extension, whilst modern, would still reflect the prevailing character of the area, and would be well integrated into the host. Taken at a wider scale, Woolram Wygate has a wide variety of dwelling types, and within that context, the features appear well integrated into the designs of the wider area.

The proposed box windows are broadly reminiscent of the more traditional design of the original dwelling on the site, helping to retain a semblance of the original development.

Render is not a primary material in the area, although it is present in sufficient quantities as not to be uncommon. The use here is clearly secondary to the redbrick proposed, creating a positive contrast. The use of render is not atypical of development in the wider Woolram Wygate area, helping to naturalise the development to a certain extent. The use of render reduces the risk of a poorer brick match, which would potentially be more impactful than the incorporation of render. In any event, a comparable effect could occur by painting the dwelling, and therefore, the tangible impacts are low.

Taking account of the design, scale, and nature of the development, as detailed above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable. The proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and would therefore be in accordance with 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.

Adequate distance has been left between the extension and the neighbouring dwellings to prevent overshadowing.

The Juliette balconies would replace existing windows. Whilst there would be a slight increase in the scope of views offered, this would not be so significant as to create a harmful overlooking effect.

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.

Adequate onsite parking has been maintained. In any event, as no new bedrooms would be created, there would be no additional need for parking.

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.

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 represents appropriate development within the defined settlement boundary. The development hereby proposed does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or amenity of nearby residents, and provides adequate parking, whilst conforming with the SELLP and the provisions of the NPPF when viewed as a whole.

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 comply with Policies 1, 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 9 and 12 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the benefits of the proposal; therefore, the planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be approved under Delegated Authority.