DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No:** | **H17-0555-26** | **Applicant:** | **Mr R Bright** |
| **Proposal:** | Proposed sun room to rear of dwelling with internal wall removal | | |
| **Location:** | Ivy House Gosberton Bank Gosberton | | |
| **Terminal Date:** | 28th August 2026 | | |

**Planning Policies**

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 01 | Spatial Strategy |
| 02 | Development Management |
| 03 | Design of New Development |
| 29 | The Historic Environment |
| 33 | Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network |
| 36 | Vehicle and Cycle Parking |

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PARISH COUNCIL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WARD MEMBER | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| WELLAND AND DEEPINGS INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| SHDC INTERNAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| OTHER STATUTORY | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| BODIES | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

## CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

### Description of Proposal

This is a householder application for the erection of a rear extension at Ivy House, Gosberton Bank. The extension would measure 6.14m (width) by 4.555m (depth) and would be located within an existing indent at the rear of the property. The extension would project beyond the south-eastern elevation by approximately 800mm, and would be in from the western elevation by approximately 550mm. The extension would feature a flat roof, set at approximately 3m, rising to 3.4m when the roof lantern is considered. The extension would be constructed of red brick. Arced brick lintels are proposed over painted casement windows and French doors.

To enable the extension, two holes would be knocked into the existing external walls. These would connect onto the kitchen and drawing room.

### Site Description

The site is outside of any settlement boundaries outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, and can therefore be considered to be within the Countryside. The dwelling is Grade II listed, being listed in 1988. The official Historic England description is as follows:

" Late C18, altered mid C19 and C20. Red brick in English bond, concrete tiled roof, 2 C19 brick gable stacks. 2 storey, 3 bay front with half glazed C19 door and overlight, with gabled hood having decorative bargeboard and knop on carved brackets. Flanked by single margin light sashes with segmental brick heads. To first floor a central blank opening is flanked by single margin light sashes with flat timber lintels."

### Relevant History

H17-0556-26 - LBC - Proposed sun room to rear of dwelling with internal wall removal - Ongoing

H17-0258-26 - Full - Proposed orangery to rear of dwelling including internal wall removal - Refused 11/05/26

H17-0260-26 - LBC - Proposed orangery to rear of dwelling including internal wall removal - Refused 11/05/26

H17-0211-05 - Condition Discharge - Details of dormers, roof, cills, cheeks, casements, sections mouldings, roof lights, etc (Condition 3 of H17/0894/04) - No decision issued

H17-0202-05 - Condition Discharge - Details of roofing materials (Part Condition 2 of H17/0893/04) - Approved 22-03-05

H17-02023-05 - Condition Discharge - Details of roofing materials (Part Condition 2 of H17/0894/04) - Approved 22-03-05

H17-0894-04 - LBC - Loft conversion, new dormers and windows and re-roof in natural slate - Approved 02-02-05

H17-0893-04 - Full - Loft conversion, new dormers and windows - Approved 02-02-05

H17-0905-97 - Condition Discharge - Details of specification of render to be used (Condition 2 of H17/0622/97) - Approved 08-09-97

H17-0622-97 - LBC - Rendering of part elevation - Approved 01/08/97

## 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

The proposal does not have an impact on the Public Highway.

Historic Environment Officer

Thank you for consulting us on this. Having reviewed the application documents and the updated available Historic Environment information for this application, the proposal is unlikely to have an impact on significant archaeological remains. The works relate to the rear, which is of lower heritage value and already altered and this is adequately covered in the HIA. Consequently, no further archaeological input is necessary for this application. It is not necessary to consult us on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like advice from us, please contact us to explain your request

Welland and Deepings Internal Drainage Board

Further to receipt of the above, I confirm that Welland & Deepings IDB have no comment to make.

Conservation Officer

I do not wish to object to this application at this stage. However, this application cannot be supported in its current form, as there are a number of small, but important ways in which the design can be improved via an amendment.
Firstly, I believe that the northwestern elevation can and should be brought out to sit flush with the side elevation of the property. As it stands, the proposal seeks to create a relatively awkward building geometry with multiple nooks and angles. By pushing out this elevation, it creates a less visually confused development without compromising on size.
Moreover, I would recommend that the windows be changed from side opening casements with a central meeting rail to a 2 over 2 sliding sash window. During the course of the previous application on site (refused) we discussed how several of the features that the applicant intended to utilise on their proposed extension were inappropriate features borrowed from the 1990s/early 2000s restoration work; this includes the casements which are not period appropriate to this building and less than ideal. I find it doubtful that should that be presented to the LPA today that the LPA would be satisfied by the introduction of such casements into the host building, and therefore, there is no reason, nor justification to permit them to be proliferated into an extension.
Moreover, I will need to see more detail of the proposed coping for the parapet (which should be authentic carved stone or possibly leaded), as well as full details of the proposed rainwater goods. It appears that the applicant proposes to make use of the existing RWGs on the rear elevation, but no details of this system are provided and nor are any elevation details presented for that return elevation - these must be provided.
If the applicant is wiling to make these amendments, and provide these details, then dependent on the nature of these provisions, I could support such a proposal. Without, I will have to recommend that the application is refused on design grounds and failure to give due regard to the conservation of the asset and its setting.
The case officer should also be minded that the applicant has not provided full details of materials at this stage. This is not necessarily an issue, but the applicant should be reminded that only the highest possible quality of materials will be acceptable - this will mean reclaimed and/or matching brick, lime mortar, and a leaded flat roof (GRP will not be accepted).

*Revised Comments, following amendments, dated 25/08/26*

I am satisfied with the design of the proposed extension, and as such, I am content that both the planning and accompanying listed building consent applications may be approved. However, this must be contingent upon the imposition of conditions to both applications requiring full details of windows, doors and a full and complete schedule of materials to be used.

I would also strongly recommend adding a note to any condition requiring details of the materials to be submitted which confirms and reminds the applicant that only the very highest quality of natural

materials will be acceptable. For the avoidance of doubt, this should mean the avoidance of modern materials such as GRP for the flat roof, PVCu for rainwater goods, or cast stone for coping, for example.

As a listed building, it is critical for the preservation of the asset that any materials are commensurate with the quality of the building and consequently it is of great importance that the applicant understands that the Local Planning Authority will take a dim view of substandard and/or synthetic modern materials and, as appropriate, will not support any proposal to use such materials.

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 would be located outside of any defined settlement boundaries, and would be classified as within the Countryside as a result. In this context, Policy 1 states:
"In the Countryside development will be permitted that is necessary to such a location and/or where it can be demonstrated that it meets the sustainable development needs of the area in terms of economic, community or environmental benefits".

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(1)(C) 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".

The proposal represents works to an existing property, and therefore, the principle of development would be in accordance with Policy S5, subject to assessment of the scale and merits of the proposal which has been carried out below.

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

*Policy Context - Design*

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 states 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 - Listed Building*

Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Policy HE6(1) of the NPPF outlines 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 29 of the SELLP outlines that all proposals shall conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated heritage assets. Section A of Policy 29 outlines criteria which applications relating to listed buildings should conform to. These are as follows:

"1. Proposals to change the use of a Listed Building or to alter or extend such a building will be granted where the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposal is in the interest of the building's preservation and does not involve activities or alterations prejudicial to the special architectural or historic interest of the Listed Building or its setting.
2. Proposals involving the demolition of Listed Buildings will not be permitted, unless in an exceptional case, or wholly exceptional case (depending on their grade) where a clear and convincing justification is made in line with national policy.
3. Proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building."

*Assessment*

The Conservation Officer has indicated no objections to the proposal on heritage grounds. They have stated that there would be no harm to the listed building.

No finalised details of materials have been presented. The "stone parapet capping" shown in the submission would be entirely inappropriate for this setting as it does not appear to be carved stone. A condition requiring the submission of materials should be placed upon any decision. These materials ought to be of the highest quality given the listed status of the building.

The extension is bulky and solid. The roof lantern, from the elevations provided, goes above the first floor window cills, creating an awkward arrangement. Likewise, the parapet would be virtually level with the cill, emphasising the bulk of the extension and reducing the integration. Moreover, the projection beyond the existing elevation would create an additional angle, and clearly mark the extension as a later addition, whilst also adding to the bulk of the dwelling.

That being said, the proposed windows clearly replicate those in the wider dwelling. The incorporation of these features helps to better integrate the extension into the host. Moreover, appropriate material detailing, as required by condition, would help to ensure further integration of the works.

Whilst the above comments regarding massing are noted, extensions of this kind are not uncommon on listed farmhouses in the area. The proposal is therefore reminiscent of a typical later extension to the dwelling, with this helping to naturalise the proposal somewhat. Moreover, whilst the effect on bulk is noted, the projection would help to demarcate the works as a later addition, which better demonstrates the evolution of the property, whilst also better preserving the original form of the dwelling.

The Conservation Officer raised concerns regarding the initial design of the extension. An amendment directly addressing their concerns was subsequently received. The Conservation Officer has raised no objections to this amendment, thereby indicating that they do not view the extension as harmful. There is nothing before this Officer to conclude otherwise. The proposal therefore conforms to Policies 2, 3 and 29 of the SELLP, as well as 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 ".

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 isolation of the dwelling means there would be no overlooking or overshadowing as a part of this proposal.

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.

The small scale and nature of the proposal mean that there would be no impact upon parking or the highway.

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 development hereby proposed does not materially harm the character or appearance of the listed building, or amenity of nearby residents, 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 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.