

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H20-0417-25 **Applicant:** Mr Coupe & Miss Roberts

Proposal: Demolition of conservatory & erection of single storey front & side extensions

Location: Markenville 17 Broadgate Road Sutton St James

Terminal Date: 1st July 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
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 4 - Decision-making
Section 11 - Making effective use of land
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

National Guidance

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
NORTH LEVEL INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of a conservatory and the erection of a single storey front and side extension on the south-western corner of the dwelling within the site, and a side extension on northern side elevation of the dwelling. The extensions are proposed to feature rendered facades and flat roof forms.

Site Description

The site comprises land at 17 Broadgate Road, Sutton St James. The site features a detached single storey bungalow. The bungalow currently features a conservatory which is located at the front of the dwelling.

The site is located within the settlement boundary of Sutton St James, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, and the accompanying policies map.

The site is within Flood Zone 3, as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps.

Relevant Planning History

H20-0575-94: (Full Application) Erection of new conservatory - approved 28 July 1994

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the consultation period are summarised below. The responses can be viewed in their entirety on South Holland District Council's website.

North Level Internal Drainage Board: No objections however details should be provided regarding the proposed surface water strategy for the site.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: The parking needs to be detailed on the proposed block plan.

Sutton St James Parish Council: No response received.

Cllr L J Eldridge: No response received.

Public Representations

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, no letters of representation have been received.

Key Planning Considerations

Development Plan

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, December 2024

(NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

There are no adopted Neighbourhood Plans for the area within which the site is located.

The main issues and considerations in this case include the following:

- Principle of Development;
- Design and Visual Impact;
- Impact on Amenity;
- Highway Safety and Parking;
- Flood Risk; and
- Biodiversity Net Gain.

These matters are assessed in turn below.

Principle of Development

Policy 1 of the Local Plan 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 boundary of Sutton St James, which is a Minor Service Centre. Policy 1 sets out that within Minor Service Centres, development will be permitted that supports their role as a service centre for the settlement itself, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities. Development will normally be limited to allocated and infill sites. Therefore, the principle of the proposed extension is acceptable, provided the design of the extension is suitable in terms of its visual and amenity impact.

Design and Visual Impact

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan outlines sustainable development considerations for development proposals, providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals.

Policy 3 accords with the provisions of Section 12 of the NPPF, in that it requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically-designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

The existing dwelling comprises a detached single storey bungalow. The dwelling features a gable end roof form within its middle section, and two side extensions that both feature flat roof forms. There is an existing boundary wall in front of the southern side extension which screens the lower part of the extension from view along the street scene. This wall is not shown within the submitted plans.

One of the extensions is proposed to be located on the south-western corner of the dwelling. The proposal seeks to extend the existing flat roof side extension and project this in front of the dwelling, replacing the existing conservatory. The conservatory measures approximately 3m by 3.1m and features a hipped roof form measuring 2.9 in height. The conservatory features approximately 0.5m of brickwork and windows on the upper parts of the structure.

The extension would measure 5m in length from the front elevation of the dwelling, and 8.2m from the existing utility room which is where the existing side extension is located. The extension is proposed to measure 7.2m in width. The extension would be taller than the existing extension, projecting above the eaves of the main dwelling. For reference, the proposed extension would measure 2.8m in height compared to the existing extension which measures 2.5m in height. The proposed extension would therefore be larger than the existing conservatory and would introduce more built form at the front of the site. Furthermore, the main dwelling features grey brickwork facades and timber cladding on the upper part of the front elevation, whereas the extension is proposed to feature light grey render.

The extension would result in the built form moving closer to the road frontage than the existing dwelling. Whilst there is no strict uniformity in terms of surrounding plot layouts, the nearest dwellings (15 and 19 Broadgate) are set back from the road frontage at a similar distance as the existing dwelling. The introduction of more built form in front of the dwelling would therefore diverge from the nearest dwellings. Furthermore, the existing side extension is partially screened by a boundary wall. The wall helps to reduce the visual impact of the extension which is not considered to be an attractive element of the dwelling. The proposal would result in the removal of this wall, making the new extension much more visually prominent within the street scene.

It is considered that the siting, scale and appearance of the extension would result in a harmful impact on the street scene. The contrasting materials combined with the height of the extension, which would extend above the eaves of the main dwelling, would result in an incongruent form of development. Whilst there is an existing conservatory on the front of the dwelling, this conservatory is considered to be a subservient addition, and the materials match the main dwelling. In contrast, the extension would result in a disproportionate addition that would result in an incongruent form of development that negatively harms the character and appearance of the area.

The other extension is proposed on the northern side elevation. There is an existing side extension located towards the rear of the dwelling. The existing extension measures approximately 3.4m in width and 5.8m in length. The proposal seeks to add an extension in front of this, measuring 7.9m in length. The existing extension features a flat roof form, and the proposed extension also features a flat roof form. The extension would also project above the eaves of the main dwelling, measuring 2.8m in height. This is considered to be unsuitable for the reasons set out previously. The submitted plans appear to show brickwork on the northern side extension, however, the agent has clarified that render is proposed and this is indicated on the submitted application form. As with the other proposed extension, the proposed rendered facades would exacerbate the visual harm of the proposal.

The proposals have been discussed with the applicant's agent and an alternative design has been discussed. It is not considered that the amended design was suitable and as such this was not added to the application. The local planning authority has discretion as to whether to accept amended proposals and in this case, it was not considered to be appropriate to accept the amended proposals.

The proposed extensions are considered to comprise poor design that would negatively impact the character and appearance of the area. The visual impact of the development would be unacceptable and as such the development does not accord with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan, or Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on 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; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Policies 2 and 3 of Local Plan set out that residential amenity and the relationship to existing development and land uses is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

The nearest dwellings to the site include 15 Broadgate to the north-east, and 19 Broadgate to the south-west. The proposed extensions are not expected to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking with either neighbouring dwelling. For example, no additional windows are proposed on the side elevations other than a bathroom window. Provided obscure glazing is used for the

bathroom window, it is considered that this would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy.

Due to the proposed siting and scale of the extensions, the development would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing. This matter weighs neutrally in the planning balance.

Therefore, the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of neighbouring properties and future occupants would be acceptable. As such, the proposed development accords with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Highway Safety and Parking

Lincolnshire County Council's Highways Team has requested that the proposed parking arrangements are set out within the site plan. This is because the proposed two additional bedrooms would result in the need for three parking spaces to be provided. This is based on the recommended parking provision set out within Appendix 6 of the Local Plan. Although not shown within the submitted plans, there is an existing front driveway that would be retained as the proposed extension would not affect this area. It is therefore not considered to be necessary for the applicant to demonstrate that three parking spaces will be provided within the curtilage of the site as there is considered to be room within the existing front driveway for three spaces. The proposed development would not result in any material harm to the surrounding highway network from a safety or capacity perspective in accordance with Policies 2, 3 and 36 of the Local Plan.

Flood Risk

The site is located within Flood Zone 3. The site is not located within a hazard rating area, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. As the site is not within a hazard area and the proposal is for single storey extensions, no specific flood risk mitigation is required in this instance as the development would not result in any increased flood risk either within the site or on any surrounding land.

Biodiversity Net Gain

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

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

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

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

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

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

For applications that are submitted prior to the introduction of this requirement, the development would be exempt from the mandatory 10% requirement and as such, the Biodiversity Gain Condition would not apply. However, this application was submitted following the introduction of this legislation. As such, unless comprising development that is exempt from this mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (10%), a condition would be required, as mandatorily set. When taking the above into account, the development in this instance the application is exempt from the statutory 10%

Biodiversity Net Gain requirements.

Planning Balance

As detailed above, Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposed development represents inappropriate development within the defined settlement boundary that would materially harm the character and appearance of the locality. The proposed development therefore does not accord with the Local Plan or the NPPF. In this instance, there are no material considerations that outweigh the harm that would result from the proposal. As such, the planning balance is against the development.

Additional Considerations

Public Sector Equality Duty

In making this decision the Authority must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act. This means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in discharging its functions) to:

A. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.

B. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. This may include removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the special needs of those with a protected characteristic; encouraging participation in public life (or other areas where they are underrepresented) of people with a protected characteristic(s).

C. Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The PSED must be considered as a relevant factor in making this decision but does not impose a duty to achieve the outcomes in s.149. It is only one factor that needs to be considered, and may be balanced against other relevant factors.

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case will have a disproportionately adverse impact on a protected characteristic.

Human Rights

In making a decision, the Authority should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as South Holland District Council to act in a manner that is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. The Authority is referred specifically to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property).

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case interferes with local residents' right to respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general public interest and the recommendation is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

Conclusion

The proposed extensions would represent an incongruent form of development within the street scene, and this would negatively impact the character and appearance of the area. The siting, scale and appearance of the proposed extensions represent poor design.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be refused under delegated authority.