DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H12-0493-26**	**Applicant:**	**Mr P & Mrs T Benson**
Proposal:	Proposed Extension & Alterations, Erection of Garden Room & Garage & Associated Site Works		
Location:	Eastview Marriots Gate Lutton		
Terminal Date:	9th 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
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	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	1	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for a rear extension and alterations to the existing dwelling within the site. Permission is also sought for the erection of a detached garden room to the north of the dwelling and a detached garage to the south of the dwelling.

Initially, it was unclear where the residential curtilage of the dwelling extended to. This was queried with the applicant's agent and additional information was provided to clarify the status of the land. Based on the review of the additional information that was provided and relevant caselaw, it is considered that the site boundary aligns with the residential curtilage of the dwelling.

Site Description

Eastview is a small residential bungalow within a predominant rural area, surrounded by large agricultural fields. Notwithstanding this, Marriots Gate provides direct access towards the settlement of Lutton.

The site is located outside any defined settlement boundary and is therefore in the open countryside as outlined in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP).

Planning History

No relevant site history.

Consultation Responses

South Holland Internal Drainage Board:

Byelaw 3 - Consent may be required

Section 23, Land Drainage Act 1991 - Consent not currently required

Byelaw 10 - We note that the applicant intends to install a parking and turning area within 9 metres of the aforementioned Board arterial watercourse (as shown in drawing number: LDC3826-03 A, LDC, May 2026). To enable this proposal, consent would be required under Byelaw 10, and we recommend that the applicant contacts this office to make an application for this consent at their earliest convenience. It is currently unclear from drawing LDC3826-03 A (LDC, May 2026) provided what the 'soft landscaping' to the west of the garage will involve. The Board requests that further information be provided to clarify what this landscaping will entail. Please note that the Board will not accept the planting of any new trees within 9 metres of the Board arterial watercourse.

Lincolnshire County Council Highways & SUDS:

First Response (11th June 2026):

The applicant should note that both the amended access and the proposed new access will require separate approval under Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. In this regard, attention is drawn to Lincolnshire County Council's Vehicle Crossings Guidance for Applicants, specifically Section 8.0. This states that a standard crossing width is 2.75m, and crossings will not normally be widened without clear justification. It also advises that only one crossing per property will generally be permitted, with additional accesses requiring robust justification.

The applicant is therefore requested to:
· Provide justification for the proposed second access serving the garden room;
· Clearly dimension the width of all accesses on the block plan, demonstrating that they accord with Lincolnshire County Council standards or are otherwise justified; and

· Notarise the block plan stating the access(es) shall be constructed in accordance with current Lincolnshire County Council specification

Additional access points increase the number of vehicle conflict points along the highway, leading to more frequent turning movements, potential uncertainty for other road users, and reduced verge continuity, and is contrary to the general principle of minimising access points in the interests of highway safety.

Second Response (26th June 2026):

The amended and proposed accesses are afforded sufficient visibility and parking arrangements are satisfactory. Works to the access within the public highway will require a Section 184 licence and will need to be constructed in accordance with the Highway Authority's specifications. Therefore, it is considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Highways informative 03 is recommended.

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. A Neighbourhood Plan has been designated for Long Sutton, however, a draft version of the plan has not yet been issued.

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;
-Highway Safety and Parking;
-Flood Risk; and
-Biodiversity Net Gain.

These matters are assessed in turn below.

Principle of Development

The South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) sets out the settlement hierarchy in respect of delivering sustainable development that 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 housing need, whilst making more sustainable use of land and to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural land by developing in sustainable locations and at appropriate densities.

Policy 1 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) sets out a spatial strategy for delivering sustainable development across South East Lincolnshire to 2036. Policy 1 (Spatial Strategy) expresses this sustainable framework of settlements, ranking the settlements deemed to be most sustainable in descending order.

Policy 1 (Spatial Strategy) of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) indicates 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.

The application site in this instance is in the countryside as detailed by Policy 1; however, the proposal solely relates to an extension, external alterations and the erection of two outbuildings. As a householder development, such works are generally accepted within the countryside provided the works are within an existing residential curtilage and provided the development is acceptable in terms of other material considerations include the design and amenity impact of the proposals.

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 similarly 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 14 of the NPPF as 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.

As the site is outside a settlement, Policy S5 of the NPPF (Principle of development outside settlements) is relevant as this policy allows for the extension of existing buildings within the countryside provided that the extension would not result in a disproportionate increase in size compared to the existing building.

The street scene along Marriot's Gate varies as there are a variety of house types and development plots within the area. The nearest dwellings include Bassett Lodge to the north and Dormer Cottage to the south. Bassett Lodge comprises a detached two-storey dwelling with rendered walls towards the front of the dwelling and brickwork walls towards the rear. Dormer Cottage comprises a detached dormer bungalow with rendered walls.

Within the site, the existing dwelling comprises a detached, single storey bungalow with a hipped roof form. The bungalow features red brickwork external walls, and the building is set back from the road frontage along Marriot's Gate by approximately 4m.

The proposed development features three main elements including the extension to the dwelling, the detached garden room and the detached garage. These are assessed in turn below.

Proposed Extension

The extension is proposed to protrude from the rear elevation of the dwelling by 6m and 4.3m from the side of the dwelling. The width of the extension is proposed to measure 13.5m.

The extension is proposed to feature a slightly sloping roof form, for which the eaves are proposed to measure 3.2m in height. This is taller than the eaves of the dwelling which measure 2.8m in height. Although the roof is slightly sloped it would likely appear flat when viewed from the street scene.

The extension is considered to be relatively large compared to the host dwelling, increasing the footprint by approximately 93sqm. As a comparison, the exiting dwelling has a built footprint of approximately 87sqm. Therefore, the extension would more than double the existing footprint.

The extension is proposed to feature cream / off-white render with a brick plinth retained at the bottom of the elevations. This would match the host dwelling as it is proposed to replace the existing brickwork with render. The proposed rendering of the dwelling and the extension is considered to be

acceptable in this instance as there are rendered dwellings to the north and south of the site. As such, the use of render would not be out of keeping for the area.

In terms of the overall design and form of the extension, the relatively flat roof form and higher eaves level of the extension would contrast with the hipped roof form of the host dwelling. As a result, it is considered that the proposed form and siting of the extension would result in some harm to the appearance of the street scene. Notwithstanding this, the extension only comprises a single storey structure, and most of the bulk of the extension would be located to the rear of the dwelling. When approaching the site from the south along Marriot's Gate, most of the rear extension would be screened by the proposed garage building. This reduces the potential visual harm when viewing the site from the south.

The extension would be more visible from Marriot's Gate when approaching the site from the north due to the scale and positioning of the extension. Whilst there would be some visual harm caused due to the visibility of the extension from this angle, the level of harm needs to be weighed in the overall planning balance.

Detached Garden Room

The detached garden room is proposed to be located to the north-west of the dwelling, relatively close to the northern side boundary with Bassett Lodge (the nearest dwelling to the north). The garden room would be located between 0.4m and 0.9m from the northern boundary.

The garden room is proposed to measure 8m in length and 4.7m in width. The building is proposed to feature a mono-pitch roof form which is proposed to measure 3.9m in height at its tallest point and 3.2 in height up to its eaves. The tallest part of the building is located on the western elevation which is the furthest elevation from Marriot's Gate.

The garden room is proposed to feature a green / sebum roof and red cedar / cedar effect timber cladding walls.

The garden room is proposed to feature its own access from Marriot's Gate with its own parking and turning area. It is unclear why an additional access is required as the dwelling already contains one vehicular access. Despite being queried with the applicant's agent the justification for the access remains unclear. Although the second access is seen as unnecessary, as set out previously, LCC's highways team have not raised any objections to the second access in highways safety terms.

It is recognised that an outbuilding could potentially be installed within this part of the site using permitted development rights, provided the relevant criteria are met. This represents a potential fallback position that needs to be taken into account.

In this case, as a mono-pitch roof form is proposed, the highest part of the building could only be 3m tall using permitted development rights and the eaves could only be 2.5m tall. Furthermore, the building would also need to be moved 2m from the northern boundary as the building can only be 2.5m tall when it is within 2m of a boundary. Therefore, the proposed building would be nearly 1m taller than permitted development rights would allow for and the eaves would also be taller.

As with the extension, the eaves of the garden room would be taller than the existing host dwelling within the site. Furthermore, an alternative roof form is proposed and different materials compared to the host dwelling. Notwithstanding this, the garden room is positioned towards the rear of the site which should help reduce its prominence from the street scene along Marriot's Gate and enable the building to retain its subservience to the host dwelling.

Detached Garage

A detached garage is proposed to the south-west of the dwelling. The building is proposed to measure 7m by 8.2m with a gable end roof form, measuring 4.4m in height up to its ridgeline and 2.8m in height up to its eaves. The height of the eaves would be similar to the existing dwelling within the site.

The building is proposed to feature red larch / larch effect horizontal timber cladding with a brick plinth. The roof is proposed to comprise a standing seam zinc roof.

Using permitted development rights, an outbuilding with a pitched roof could potentially be installed

within the site; however, its ridgeline height would be limited to 4m and its eaves height would be limited to 2.5m. Therefore, the current proposal seeks to install a larger outbuilding.

Whilst the gable end roof form and external materials would differ from the host dwelling which features a hipped roof form and alternative materials, overall the building is considered to be subservient to the host dwelling in terms of its scale. Furthermore, the proposed siting of the garage towards the rear of the site behind the dwelling should assist to integrate the building within the street scene.

Overall Visual Impact

Overall, whilst the proposed design is not ideal and some visual harm would result due to the form and appearance of the extension, it is considered that the visual impact of the development would be acceptable on balance. As set out previously, the street scene along Marriot's Gate varies greatly and there is no strict uniformity in terms of the appearance the nearest dwellings to the site. Furthermore, the proposed garage building would largely screen views of the extension from the south. The extension would be most visible when viewing the site from the north; however, due to the single storey form of the extension, it is considered that the harm would not be significant in this case.

Impact on Residential Amenity/Land Users

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.

Due to the proposed scale and siting of the extension and proposed outbuildings, the development is not expected to result in a significant degree of overshadowing of the nearest properties.

Although the garden room would be relatively close to the northern boundary with Bassett Lodge, it is not considered that the siting of the building would have an overbearing impact on the amenity of occupants of Bassett Lodge.

A window is proposed on the northern side elevation of the garden room building which would be very close to the site boundary (less than 1m). Although this has the potential to result in overlooking with the property to the north, there is a boundary hedge between the properties which provides a degree of screening. Furthermore, the window would be connected to a hallway area rather than the main part of the garden room. As such, it is unlikely that occupants would spend significant amounts of time within the hallway area, and this reduces the potential degree of overlooking.

A window is proposed on the northern elevation of the extension and this window would connect to the kitchen / living / dining room space within the dwelling. There would be approximately 12m between this window and the northern boundary. As set out previously, there is a boundary hedge that provides a degree of screening between the properties and it is considered that 12m is a sufficient separation distance to prevent an unacceptable degree of overlooking.

Therefore, the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the residential amenity of future occupants and the nearest dwellings in accordance with 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 of the Local Plan 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 36 and Appendix 6 of the Local Plan, set out minimum vehicle parking standards. The standards require at least two spaces for dwellings of up to three bedrooms, and three spaces for dwellings with four or more bedrooms.

The proposal seeks to install an additional vehicular access to the north of the existing access on Marriot's Gate. The proposal also seeks to provide two larger driveway areas.

Initially, Lincolnshire County Council's highways team asked for additional information including the following:

-Justification for the proposed second access serving the garden room;
-Confirm the dimensions of the accesses on the block plan, demonstrating that they accord with Lincolnshire County Council standards or are otherwise justified; and
-Update the block plan stating the access(es) shall be constructed in accordance with current Lincolnshire County Council specification.

The site plan has subsequently been updated and the highways team confirmed in their second consultation response that they no longer have any concerns with the proposals in terms of highway safety.

Therefore, the proposal would have an acceptable impact on highway safety in accordance with Local Plan Policies 2, 3 and 36, and 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.

Policy 4 of the Local Plan sets out that development within Flood Zones 2 and 3 will be permitted in instances where specific criteria is met.

The site lies within Flood Zone 3 as identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk maps. These maps have been created as a tool to raise awareness of flood risk with the public and partner organisations, such as Local Authorities, Emergency Services and Drainage Authorities. The Maps do not take into account any flood defences.

Whilst minor developments such as householder developments must meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments, they should not be subject to the sequential test, nor the exception test, as outlined in Policy F5 of the NPPF.

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 located within a 'Danger for Most' hazard area; however, no specific mitigation is recommended within the SFRA for householder proposals.

Despite the property being within Flood Zone 3 and Danger for Most within the SFRA, as the application is purely for an extension and two outbuildings to an existing residential property; there would not be any significant harm raised, and it would not materially increase the flood risk for the site and surrounding area in a harmful way.

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

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.

Overall, whilst some visual harm would result due to the form and appearance of the proposed extension, it is considered that the visual impact of the development would be acceptable on balance for the previously referenced reasons. The development is considered to be acceptable in terms of other material considerations such as the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, highway safety and in flood risk terms.

Therefore, in this instance, there are no material considerations that weigh significantly 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.