

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H16-0782-26 **Applicant:** Eastfield Guesthouse Ltd

Proposal: Change of use from Residential (C3) to Hotel (C1) - Approved under H16-0227-24. Modification of Condition 2 to allow amendments to previously approved plans

Location: 78 Pinchbeck Road Spalding

Terminal Date: 12th 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
09	Promoting a Stronger Visitor Economy
29	The Historic Environment
30	Pollution
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 20 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	0	0	0	1
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1

SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	1	0
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This application is made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, seeking to amend condition 2 of H16-0227-24. It is proposed that an additional bedroom would be added on the ground floor, replacing the kitchen.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Spalding, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The site is located fairly centrally within Spalding, along one of the main arterial roads within the town. The site is located approximately 500 metres north of the defined town centre.

78 Pinchbeck Road is fairly typical of the area, although it can be distinguished via the use of black detail work on the gable ends. The property is a large three-bedroom house constructed of red bricks with white UPVC windows.

Relevant History

H16-0227-24 - Full - Change of use from Residential (C3) to Hotel (C1) - Approved 03-06-24

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:

Environment Agency

We did not comment on or recommend Condition 2 on application H16-0227-24 and therefore have no comment to make on this application.

Conservation Officer

We have no objection to the proposal on built heritage grounds. The proposed works are to the interior of the building, and no external alterations to the building or site are proposed. As a result, the development would not affect the character or appearance of the conservation area

Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority

Deferral: LCC is not currently in a position to support the application and requests further assessment, supporting evidence, revisions and/or dialogue, as set out in the response.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED

The Local Highway Authority notes that the application would increase the hotel accommodation from five to six letting rooms while retaining four parking spaces. Parking provision was queried during the original application but was not resolved before determination. The applicant states that the car park has been monitored since November 2024, with only three customer vehicles recorded in total and the car park never fully occupied. However, no monitoring records, methodology, hotel occupancy data, or information on staff parking have been provided to substantiate this claim. Please therefore provide:

A dimensioned layout demonstrating that four spaces can be independently accessed and exited with suitable manoeuvring space.

Confirmation of arrangements for guest, staff, servicing, and drop-off parking.

The monitoring records and methodology, including hotel occupancy and maximum simultaneous parking demand.

Details of secure cycle parking.

This information is reasonably required under the August 2026 NPPF transport policies to establish that safe and suitable access can be maintained, that the parking arrangements respond appropriately to the development's operational needs, and that any highway safety impacts arising from the proposed intensification can be addressed. The site's accessibility by alternative modes is acknowledged but does not, without supporting evidence, demonstrate that the proposed parking arrangements are adequate.

Environmental Protection

No comments regarding modification of condition 2.

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 - S73

The proposal seeks to vary Condition 2 of H16-0227-24, through seeking permission under Section 73 of the Act. The purpose of an application made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is to vary or remove conditions associated with an existing planning permission. These applications are used to allow for amendments to an approved scheme and can be made both retrospectively and prior to a permission being implemented, as long as the permission is extant.

The Act is very clear that: "On such an application the Local Planning Authority shall consider only the question of the conditions subject to which planning permission should be granted." As such, the Local Planning Authority are not able to revisit the principle of development and only matters relevant to the specific conditions can be considered. The effect of granting permission would be to issue a new permission with Condition XXX amended, together with any other relevant conditions from the original permission, or subsequent relevant revisions since this permission.

Planning practice guidance highlights that where less substantial changes are proposed, amending a proposal can occur through 'Amending the conditions attached to the planning permission, including seeking to make minor material amendments'.

The PPG clarifies that "Permission granted under Section 73 takes effect as a new, independent permission to carry out the same development as previously permitted subject to new or amended conditions. The new permission sits alongside the original permission, which remains intact and unamended. It is open to the applicant to decide whether to implement the new permission or the one originally granted". There is no statutory definition of a 'minor material amendment'; but this is likely to include any amendments where its scale and/or nature results "in a development which is not substantially different from the one which has been approved".

In this instance, the subsequent amendments, submitted under this Section 73 application, have not varied the description of development.

In the case of R (Vue Entertainment Limited) v City of York Council, it was concluded that the decision gives clear support for use of S73 in respect of changes to condition which go beyond 'minor' amendments. It places a clear emphasis on preserving the precise terms of the grant. If an amendment to a condition can be made which keeps the description of the development intact it may well be appropriate to make such an application under a s.73, even if the effect of the change will be significant".

Paragraph 13 of the relevant section of the PPG states "In contrast to section 96A, an application

made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 can be used to make a material amendment by varying or removing conditions associated with a planning permission. There is no statutory limit on the degree of change permissible to conditions under s73, but the change must only relate to conditions and not to the operative part of the permission."

Evaluation - Key Considerations

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

The principle of development has been considered to be acceptable under H16-0227-24. As a S73 application there is no requirement to revisit the principle of development here.

The proposal would therefore conform to the requirements of S4 of the NPPF, and Policies 1 and 9 of the SELLP, as per the considerations made under H16-0227-24.

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

Policy Context - Character Implications

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.

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.

Policy Context - Historic Environment

The site lies within Spalding Conservation Area and lies within close proximity to a number of listed buildings and structures; including those listed within the site description section of this report.

In respect of any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, through Section 72 the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The NPPF expresses the importance of considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets; advising that development and alterations to designated assets and their settings can cause harm. These policies ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic buildings and environments. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance should be treated favourably.

Policy HE6 of Section 20 of the NPPF states that "When considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance".

The above assessment of impact should be informed by the submission of an appropriate Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). On this point, Policy HE5(1) of the NPPF outlines that "proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance." HE5(2) outlines that this assessment should identify whether the proposal would have a positive effect, no effect or harm to the asset, and the degree of harm caused.

The aforementioned harm can be divided into harm, substantial harm, or total loss. HE6(4) outlines that in such circumstances the harm must be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal, with the extent of benefits required to outweigh harm being determined, in part, by the extent of harm.

Policy HE9(1) of the NPPF states: "Development proposals within or affecting the significance of conservation areas should:

- a. Retain and conserve buildings and other features which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area where possible; and
- b. Consider the area's special architectural or historic interest (as identified as part of the designation of the conservation area) in the design of development"

Policy 29 (The Historic Environment) states amongst other matters that the distinctive elements of the South East Lincolnshire historic environment will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced, in keeping with the policies in the NPPF. Development proposals will be expected to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated and non-designated heritage assets. Policy 29 is broken into five interrelated sections, with part B relevant here.

Policy 29B, relating to conservation areas, states: "Proposals within, affecting the setting of, or affecting views into or out of, a Conservation Area should preserve (and enhance or reinforce, as appropriate) features that contribute positively to the area's character, appearance and setting. Proposals should:

1. Retain buildings/groups of buildings, existing street patterns, historic building lines and ground surfaces;
2. Retain architectural details that contribute to the character and appearance of the area;
3. Where relevant and practical, remove features which are incompatible with the Conservation Area;
4. Retain and reinforce local distinctiveness with reference to height, massing, scale, form, materials and plot widths of the existing built environment;
5. Assess, and mitigate against, any negative impact the proposal might have on the townscape, roofscape, skyline and landscape;"

To this end, all proposals in the Conservation Area or which affect listed buildings should preserve or enhance their settings.

Assessment

The proposal must be considered in light of the existing permission which it seeks to modify. The addition of a single bedroom would not alter the appearance or character of the site. No external alterations are proposed, preventing a wider visual impact.

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 cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area and would therefore be in accordance with Policies 2, 3 and 29 of the SELLP and Sections 14 and 20 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".

As no external alterations are proposed, the proposal would not increase overshadowing levels. No new windows are proposed, preventing increased overlooking. The addition of a single bedroom would not increase the level of noise emissions or disturbance.

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."

Policy TR3 of the NPPF outlines that development should be located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure. The policy outlines a series of principles to achieve these aims, with the expectation that all proposals should, so far as is relevant, conform to them. Policy TR3(2) is explicit that "The Connectivity Tool should be used alongside other relevant quantitative or qualitative evidence in assessing the connectivity of particular locations proposed for development."

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.

Whilst the comments of the Highway Authority are noted, the addition of a single bedroom would not significantly alter the highway impacts of development. Whilst anecdotal, the evidence provided by the Applicant shows that number of vehicles which have used the site since November 2024 is

three. This evidences a lack of need for additional parking, despite the additional bedroom, and the lack of overall impacts emerging from the development. The existing vehicle crossing was deemed acceptable under the previous application, and it is not considered that an additional bedroom would augment these considerations.

The site is readily accessible via sustainable modes of transport, with a bus stop almost immediately outside of the property's entrance, as well as the bus and train stations being within a reasonable walking distance (as per the definition in the Manual for Streets). There is therefore a reduced need for additional vehicle parking.

Whilst no dedicated cycle storage facilities have been shown on the plans, there is a storage area shown on the floor plans. The Applicant has indicated that this could reasonably be used for cycle storage also.

Furthermore, due to the location of the development within Spalding, there are a number of public car park options which could reasonably be utilised by future guests at the hotel should additional parking provision be required.

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". This is supported by Policy 4 of the NPPF.

Whilst the provisions of these policies are noted, the addition of a single bedroom on the ground floor would not necessitate a re-application of the sequential or exceptions tests. Moreover, it would not significantly increase the vulnerability of the property to the impacts of flooding, particularly in light of the flood risk identified within the assessment under H16-0782-26.

Conditions

It is considered that all conditions imposed under the previous permission should be reimposed here, with the exception of the time limitation as the permission has been implemented, with the appropriate adaptations to reflect the updated plans. The exception being the condition requiring the details of the parking arrangements to be conducted prior to first occupation, seeing as the property has now been occupied.

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, 4, 33 and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 4, 14, 15, 17 and 20 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.