

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING
--

Application No:	H11-1172-25	Applicant:	Mr & Mrs B Wenham
Proposal:	Extension & Alterations		
Location:	43 Garnsgate Road Long Sutton Spalding		
Terminal Date:	29th January 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

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 4 - Decision-making
Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
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

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
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
RESIDENTS	1	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension, a single storey rear extension to replace an existing conservatory and other external alterations such as the installation of cladding on the front elevation. The extension is proposed to be located on the southern side of the dwelling, featuring a gable end roof form that would be slightly lower than the ridgeline of the main part of the dwelling. The materials are proposed to match the existing materials on the rest of the dwelling.

Site Description

The application site comprises land at 43 Garnsgate Road, Long Sutton. The site features a two storey detached dwelling.

The site is within the settlement limits of Long Sutton, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (March 2019) and the accompanying policies map.

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

Relevant Planning History

H11-0520-25: (Full Application) Proposed Two Storey Extension - approved 11 July 2025.

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.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board: Whilst the site in question lies within the Internal Drainage District of the South Holland Internal Drainage Board, the proposal does not meet our threshold for commenting as per our Planning and Byelaw Strategy. Therefore, the Board has no comments to make.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: This proposal is for extension & alterations and the access and parking arrangements remain unchanged; therefore, it is considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Long Sutton Parish Council: No response received.

Cllr A C Tennant: No response received.

Cllr J Tyrell: No response received.

Cllr D J Wilkinson: 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, one representation has been received from a member of the public. The response is summarised below:

- The development will substantially reduce the amount of natural daylight entering into 41 Garnsgate Road on the side elevation to habitable rooms, particularly affecting the dining room, front elevation of the side bay window, small inner hallway, front and rear bedroom.
- The extension wall to the gable end being extended and the full height 2 storey extension will not provide enough light to 3 habitable rooms.
- Due to the height, scale and proximity of the proposed extension it will cast prolonged shadows

over 41 Garnsgate Road resulting in reduced sunlight for much of the day, a darker and colder environment to access to the side and rear elevation and the loss of amenity and enjoyment of outdoor space.

-The proposed materials to the development of composite cladding to the full height and wrap round on the gable end wall and front elevation is deemed a potential fire risk due to the close proximity to the boundary and build line of the property 41 Garnsgate Road. The choice of natural wood composite cladding and pale grey windows is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding detached homes and will not be integrated with the existing main dwelling

-The proposed materials, extension and alterations are in conflict with the Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF in that it requires development to comprise of good design and adds positively to the surround area and would not have an adverse impact to the character and appearance of the immediate area.

-Most of the dwellings in Garnsgate Road are detached and consist of 2 storey dwellings set back from the road frontage. The proposed extension is a 3 storey dwelling which is not uniform to the street scene of Garnsgate Road.

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;
- Visual and Amenity Impact;
- Flood Risk;
- 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 defined settlement of Long Sutton which is a Main Service Centre. Policy 1 sets out that development in this type of settlement 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. In this case, the proposal solely relates to the extension of an existing dwelling. Therefore, the principle of such development is appropriate, comprising an appropriate form of development for the location. This is provided the design of the extension is

suitable in terms of its visual and amenity impact and other material considerations.

Visual and Amenity 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. Paragraph 135 also 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.

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.

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 existing dwelling comprises a detached two-storey dwelling, located to the south-west of Garnsgate Road. There is a mixture of house types along Garnsgate Road, including two storey dwellings and bungalows. Most of the dwellings are detached and set back from the road frontage. The nearest dwellings to the site are two-storey detached dwellings featuring a mixture of gable and hipped roof forms. Therefore, there is no strict uniformity within the street scene.

The proposed side extension would be located on the southern side of the dwelling above an existing flat roofed side extension on the southern side of the dwelling. The proposal seeks to extend above this existing extension. As such, the building footprint at the ground floor level would remain similar; however, it is proposed to extend further to the rear of the site by approximately 2.3m. The existing side extension is approximately 0.5m from the south-eastern boundary which adjoins 41 Garnsgate Road.

The extension is proposed to measure 8.5m in height up to its ridgeline, which is slightly lower than the ridgeline of the existing dwelling. Concerns have been raised within the public representation that the proposals would create a 3-storey dwelling. Whilst internally there would be 3 floors, the proposals would not increase the height of the existing ridgeline.

The extension would bring the overall built form closer to the boundary with 41 Garnsgate Road and the public representation raises concerns with the visual impact of the extension and the loss of daylight that would result. Whilst there is no strict sense of uniformity within the street scene, the nearest dwellings to the site comprise detached two storey dwellings which are located relatively close to one another. The proposed extension would continue the existing building line of the dwelling, with the eaves and ridgeline set at a similar height. As such, the visual impact of the extension within the street scene is considered to be acceptable.

The extension would be located close to the boundary with 41 Garnsgate Road. The nearest elevation of 41 Garnsgate Road is its north-eastern side elevation. There are two windows located towards the rear of the side elevation at the ground and first floor levels. Due to their position on a north-eastern elevation, it is likely that these windows do not let in a significant amount of light throughout the day and that they are secondary windows. The height of the extension towards the rear of the site is lower than at the front of the site, measuring 6.2m in height and featuring a gable end roof form. The orientation of the gable end roof form combined with the smaller roof height would help to lessen the impact on the dwelling to the south. Whilst the extension might result in some loss of light at certain parts of the day, it is not considered that this would result in an adverse impact in terms of overshadowing.

Concerns have also been raised within the public representation that the use of composite cladding would present a fire safety risk and would be out of keeping with the character of the area. The extensions are proposed to feature brickwork to match the existing dwelling and cladding is only proposed on the dormer window. As such, the proposed materials are considered to be suitable as

the matching materials would help integrate the extension with the main dwelling, ensuring that the visual impact within the street scene is acceptable.

No side windows are proposed other than the existing side windows on the northern elevation. As such, the proposals would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking with dwellings to the north and south of the site. Furthermore, the only dwelling that is located to the rear of the site is Celey House, which is approximately 80m from the existing rear elevation of 43 Garnsgate Road. Therefore, there is a suitable separation distance between the proposed rear extension and Celey House and as such, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking with Celey House.

A replacement front porch is proposed which would be positioned on a similar building footprint. The existing porch features a flat roof whereas the replacement porch is proposed to feature a sloped roofline. The porch is considered to be proportionate and of a suitable scale and appearance.

A pitched roof is proposed on the existing front dormer window, which is proposed to feature composite cladding. The visual impact of the pitched roof is acceptable.

A single storey rear extension is proposed to replace the existing conservatory. The footprint of the extension would remain the same as the existing footprint. A gable end roof pitch is proposed, measuring 3.5m up to the ridgeline and 2.4m up to the eaves. Due to the scale and siting of the extension, the extension would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing. Furthermore, the extension is unlikely to be visible from the street scene due to its siting at the rear of the dwelling.

Therefore, the development would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area, or on the amenity of neighbouring properties and future occupants. As such, the proposals accord with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk

The site is located within Flood Zone 3; however, the proposal is not required to pass the sequential or exception tests in flood risk terms as the proposal is for a householder development. Nonetheless, Paragraph 176 of the NPPF requires the proposal be accompanied by a site-specific flood risk assessment.

The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) categorises various areas within the district under hazard ratings and the SFRA sets out guidance and recommended mitigation measures for different types of development within each of the hazard rating areas. In this case the site is partly within a 'Danger to Most' area and partly within a 'Danger to Some' area. However, the SFRA does not identify any specific mitigation measures for householder applications. As such, no specific flood risk mitigation measures are required in this instance. Furthermore, it is not considered that the development would result in any increased flood risk either within the site or on any surrounding land. Therefore, the development is therefore acceptable in terms of flood risk.

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.

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 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.