DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H11-0727-26**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs P Clark**
Proposal:	Extension to garage roof and conversion to annexe		
Location:	The Pines Station Road Long Sutton		
Terminal Date:	28th September 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
30	Pollution
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework August 2026

Section 3 - Decision-making policies (DM1 - 10)
Section 4 - Achieving sustainable development (S1 - S6)
Section 12 - Making effective use of land (L1 - 3)
Section 14 - Achieving well-designed places (DP1 - 4)
Section 15 - Promoting sustainable transport (TR1 - 8)
Section 17 - Pollution, public protection and security (P1 - 6)
Section 18 - Managing flood risk and coastal change (F1 - 9)

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
PLANNING LIAISON OFFICER - FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT	0	0	0	1
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1

SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for the conversion of a garage into a residential annexe. As part of the proposals, a roof extension is proposed to provide additional living space within the building. The extension would result in the creation of an additional floor within the building.

Site Description

The site comprises land at The Pines, which is a detached two storey dwelling located on Station Road in Long Sutton. The Pines is set within a relatively spacious plot with an existing garage building located to the rear of the dwelling.

The site is within the settlement boundary of Long Sutton, as identified by Policy 1 in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) 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

H11-1449-01: (Outline Application) Residential development - refused 21st February 2002 - appeal dismissed 30 October 2002

H11-0126-03: (Outline Application) Residential development (means of access committed) - approved 24th April 2003

H11-0946-04: (Full Application) Erection of detached house and detached double garage - approved 01st September 2004

H11-1609-04: (Discharge of Conditions) Details of Site Contamination Report (Condition 3 of H11/0946/04) - approved 01st April 2005

Consultation Responses

Responses have been received from the below referenced consultees. The responses are summarised below; however, the responses can be viewed in their entirety on the South Holland website.

Long Sutton Parish Council:

There are no observations in relation to this application.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS:

Whilst the application form states that parking would not be affected, the conversion of the garage would alter the existing parking arrangements and, through the increase in bedroom numbers, increase the level of parking provision required. Notwithstanding this, there remains sufficient space within the dwelling frontage to accommodate the necessary off-street parking, including adequate turning space, plus the access remains unchanged. Therefore, the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Environment Agency:

No objections.

We wish to highlight that the site has a future hazard classification of 'Danger for Most' (includes the general public) and could experience flood depths of 0.5 - 1.0m arising from a breach in the defences during a flood that has a 0.5% chance of ccurring in any one year up to 2115.

The proposed annexe is therefore at risk of inundation in the event of a breach of the defences. We therefore advise that flood resistance and resilience measures are incorporated into the development and that flood emergency measures are implemented.

It is also recommended that a a flood warning and evacuation plan is provided.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board:

Byelaw 3 (Surface Water): The applicant's proposals do not indicate an increase in impermeable area resulting in the disposal of additional surface water, therefore Byelaw 3 (surface water) does not apply.

Byelaw 3 (Treated Foul Water): We note that the applicant has not indicated how they propose to dispose of foul water from the development. If the applicant proposes to discharge treated foul water to a watercourse, consent would be required under Byelaw 3. Please note that any consent granted for the discharge of treated foul water is likely to be subject to a Treated Foul Water Development Contribution fee (TFWDC) as outlined within our Development Control Charges and Fees.

Section 23, Land Drainage Act 1991: We note the presence of a watercourse which is not maintained by the Board (a riparian watercourse) adjacent to the southern site boundary. Whilst not currently proposed, should the applicant's proposals change to include works to alter the riparian watercourse, or if works are proposed to alter the watercourse at any time in the future, consent would be required under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and Byelaw 4).

We also note the presence of a Board arterial watercourse (DRN199G3204 - H32 Naylors Gate Drain) adjacent to the southern site boundary. Whilst not currently proposed, should the applicant's proposals change to include works to alter the watercourse, or if works are proposed to alter the watercourse at any time in the future, consent would be required under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and Byelaw 4).

Byelaw 10: Whilst not currently proposed, should the applicant's proposals change to include works within 9 metres of the aforementioned Board arterial watercourse, or if works within 9 metres of the watercourse are proposed at any time in the future, consent would be required under Byelaw 10.

Cllr A C Tennant: No response received.

Cllr J Tyrell: 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 representations have been received from members of the public.

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, August 2026 (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, Layout and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area;
-Impact on Residential 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 of Long Sutton which is identified as a Main Service Centre. Policy 1 sets out that within Main 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.

There are no specific policies within the Local Plan or within the NPPF which set out how proposals for annexes should be determined. This is likely because there are permitted development rights that allow for the use of ancillary buildings as annexes and this represents a potential fallback position in this case. Notwithstanding this, where planning permission is required, proposals for annexes are expected to be of a size and scale reflecting their ancillary function. In most instances, annexes should demonstrate dependency on the relevant host dwelling in some degree. For example, through physical linkage, close siting, the provision of limited accommodation, the sharing of curtilage and facilities, and the ability to be used as part of the main dwelling at a later date. Case law has established that the provision of facilities for independent living would not necessarily result in the creation of a separation planning unit from the host dwelling. This is a matter of fact and degree.

In this case, the building where the annexe is proposed is located to the rear and side of the dwelling. It is unclear who intends to occupy the building; however, it is presumed that the annexe would be occupied by relatives. The plans do not refer to a kitchen area and as such, it is presumed that occupants of the annexe would have some reliance on the host dwelling to use their kitchen facilities.

The annexe would be accessed from the existing driveway at the front of the site and the annexe would also share garden space with the host dwelling. Whilst the annexe would replicate some the facilities within the host dwelling, the annexe would be within an existing ancillary building. As such, the annexe would remain subservient to the host dwelling and a planning condition can be included to limit the occupation of the annexe to ensure that it remains part of the planning unit. Therefore, the principle of development is acceptable, and the proposal is considered to accord with Policy 1 of the Local Plan.

Design, Layout and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

Policy DP3 (Key principles for well-designed places) of the NPPF states 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.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan 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.

Policy 3 of the Local Plan 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 garage measures 6.4m by 6.4m and this would remain unchanged as the building footprint of the garage is not proposed to be expanded. Currently, the garage building features only one floor whereas the annexe conversion would result in the provision of an additional floor within the building.

The existing garage building features a hipped roof form that measures 4.5m in height at its tallest point and the building measures 2.5m in height up to its eaves.

The proposal seeks to install a roof extension featuring a gable end roof form. The building is proposed to measure 5.9m in height up to its ridgeline and the eaves would remain the same as their current height. Therefore, the overall height and scale of the building would increase, and it is considered that the garage would be relatively tall for a standard outbuilding. Notwithstanding this, the host dwelling is relatively large and the garage building is located to the rear and side of the dwelling, thereby reducing its prominence within the street scene. Therefore, in this case, the proposed increase in the scale and height of the building is considered to be acceptable.

Currently, the garage building features two roller shutter doors on the front elevation. The proposal seeks to replace the two roller shutter doors with two windows and a door and infill brickwork is proposed on the lower level of the elevation. A window is proposed on the southern side elevation and on the rear elevation, the existing doorway and window are proposed to be retained. No windows are proposed on the northern side elevation. Lastly, two rooflights are proposed on the front roof slope and a further roof light is proposed on the rear roof slope. The visual impact of these combined changes is considered to be acceptable.

The materials for the extension are proposed to match the existing materials on the host dwelling and existing garage building. The matching materials would help integrate the extension with the existing structure.

As such, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable visual impact in accordance with Section 14 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy P3 (Living conditions and pollution) of the NPPF sets out that development 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. The policy also sets out that proposals should not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site.

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

There is only an agricultural building to the east of the site and there are no dwellings to east. The nearest dwelling to the north is Glendale (61 Station Road) and the nearest dwelling to the south is 63 Station Road. The proposed annexe is unlikely to affect the amenity of 63 Station Road as the existing dwelling within the site largely screens views between the proposed annexe building and No.63.

In terms of the potential impact on Glendale, no windows are proposed on the northern side elevation of the building. Whilst roof lights are proposed on the front and rear roof slopes of the building, these rooflights would not face directly towards any elevations on Glendale or its amenity space.

The garage building is already located adjacent to the site boundary with Glendale and the proposal seeks to increase the height of the building from 4.5m up to 5.9m. This could result in some loss of light within the rear garden of Glendale due to the proximity of the building to the site boundary. Notwithstanding this, Glendale features a relatively spacious rear garden, and it is not considered that the loss of some light within the rear garden would result in an adverse impact compared to the impact of the existing building.

The proposed development would not result in a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of future occupants or on neighbouring properties. Therefore, the development would accord with the Section 17 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan.

Highway Safety and Parking

Policy TR6 (Assessing transport impacts) of the NPPF sets out that development proposals should only be refused on highways grounds 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.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan sets out 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 Local Plan, 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.

No changes are proposed to the vehicular access to the site. Sufficient room would be retained within the site for parking and turning. Lincolnshire County Council's Highways Team have not raised any objections to the proposals. Therefore, the proposed development would have an acceptable impact in terms of highway safety in accordance with Policies 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the Local Plan, as well as Section 15 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk

Section 18 of the NPPF sets out guidance relating to how local authorities should assess and determine applications which are subject to flood risk concerns.

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

Policy 4 of the Local Plan allows for certain types of development within Flood Zones 2 and 3 in instances where specific criteria are met.

The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) provides an overview of how flood risk has been considered in shaping the proposals of the Local Plan; including the spatial strategy and the assessment of housing and employment sites. Within the SFRA, areas across South Holland have been identified according to the level of hazard that is posed in terms of flood risk. Appendix C of the SFRA sets out guidance in terms of the minimum measures that are required according to what hazard category areas fall under. In this case, the site is within a 'Danger for Most' hazard rating area. As such, no specific mitigation is recommended within the SFRA.

Notwithstanding this, the Environment Agency has set out within their consultation response for the application that due to the site's location within a Danger for Most hazard area, the annexe is at risk of inundation in the event of a breach of the defences. Therefore, the Environment Agency has advised that flood resistance and resilience measures are incorporated into the development. It is considered that such measures can be secured via a compliance condition.

The Environment Agency has also recommended that a flood warning and evacuation plan is provided; however, in this instance it is considered that future occupants could access the host dwelling as a place of refuge if needed in the event of a severe flood.

Therefore, it is considered that in terms of flood risk, the proposed development accords with Policy 4 of the Local Plan and Section 18 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.

As such, unless comprising development that is exempt from this mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)(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% BNG requirements as the proposal is a householder development.

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 the amenity of nearby residents. The proposal would have an acceptable impact in terms of highway safety and flood risk and it is considered that the proposal accords with the Local Plan and the NPPF when viewed as a whole. 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, 4, 30 and 36 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.