DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H23-0377-25**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs D Ford**
Proposal:	Extension & Alterations		
Location:	Carlton Lodge Oxcroft Bank Shepeau Stow		
Terminal Date:	17th June 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

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	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for a single storey rear extension. The extension is proposed to measure 5m by 6.9m, to feature a gable end roof form and to feature red brickwork to match the main dwelling within the site.

Site Description

The site comprises land at Carlton Lodge, Oxcroft Bank, Shepeau Stow. The site features a detached two storey dwelling, which includes a single storey side extension. The area agricultural and horticultural buildings to the north and east of the site.

The site is located outside the settlement boundary of Shepeau Stow, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, and the accompanying policies map.

The site is within Flood Zones 1 and 2, as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps.

Relevant Planning History

H23-0275-91: (Outline Application) Erection of dwelling with garage including' vehicular access' - approved 24 July 1991

H23-0889-91: (Reserved Matters) Proposed house with garage including vehicular' access' - approved 20 November 1991

H23-1364-03: (Full Application) Erection of two-storey side extension to dwelling and garage - approved 29 December 2003

H23-0809-24: (Full Application) Change of use of agricultural land to extend domestic curtilage - Retrospective - approved 11 December 2024

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.

Whaplode Parish Council: No comment.

Lincolnshire County Council: Highways and SUDS: No objections. The extension will form extra living accommodation and there will be no increase in bedrooms. There will be no impact on the access or parking and therefore it will not have an adverse impact on the public highway.

Cllr A C Beal: No response received.

Cllr P A Redgate: 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; 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 outside any defined settlement boundary and is therefore within the countryside in planning policy terms. Notwithstanding this, the proposal solely relates to the erection of a single storey extension. Therefore, the principle of such development is appropriate, 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 two storey dwelling with a single storey side extension. The dwelling features gable end roof forms and red brickwork facades.

The proposed extension would be located on the rear elevation of the dwelling, and would therefore by located to the south-east of the dwelling. The extension would measure 5m by 6.9m and feature a gable end roof form, measuring 3.8m up to the ridgeline. A flue is proposed near the side of the elevation which measures 4.7m in height. The flue would not extend above the eaves of the main dwelling which measure 5.1m in height. The extension would be subservient to the host dwelling and would not be out of keeping with the street scene. The proposed scale, siting and appearance of the extension is therefore considered to be acceptable.

The proposed materials include brickwork to match the brickwork on the main dwelling. Smooth brown tiles are proposed instead of corrugated brown tiles which feature on the rest of the dwelling. As the extension would be located at the rear of the dwelling, the proposed roof tiles would not be particularly prominent within the street scene. The proposed tiles are therefore acceptable as they

would match the colour of the main dwelling helping the proposed extension to tie-in and harmonise with the host dwelling visually. It is considered appropriate to include a condition requiring the proposed brickwork to match the existing brickwork as closely as possible in the interests of visual amenity.

The visual impact of the proposed development is therefore acceptable. The proposed development would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area and would therefore accord with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and 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 dwelling to the site is Jo-da which is located to the south. There are two other dwellings located further to the south, Nook House and Nods Nook Barn. The site is otherwise surrounded by agricultural fields and horticultural and agricultural buildings.

A window is proposed on the southern side elevation of the proposed extension. There is approximately 9m between this elevation and the southern site boundary. The site boundary features a timber fence which provides screening between the elevation and Jo-da to the south. As such, the positioning of this window should not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking or loss of privacy.

Due to the proposed siting and scale of the extension, the development would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing or loss of light. Neither would the extension appear overbearing to any harmful degree.

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.

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.

Other Matters

The proposed extension would not alter the parking requirements for the site. As such, the proposals should not result in an adverse impact in terms of highway safety.

The site is located within Flood Zones 1 and 2. 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 a single storey rear extension, no specific flood risk mitigation is required in this instance.

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 locality, or amenity of nearby residents. The proposed development therefore accords with the Local Plan and the NPPF. In this instance, there are no material considerations that weigh against the proposal and as such, the planning balance is in favour of 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

Taking the above considerations into account, the proposal is considered to accord with Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Local Plan, along with the identified sections contained within the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that indicate against the proposal and outweigh the consideration in favour of the proposal and the policies referred to above.

Recommendation

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