DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H01-0843-20**	**Applicant:**	**Mr D Ashby**
Proposal:	Proposed Side Extension		
Location:	3 Stone Gate Cowbit Spalding		
Terminal Date:	25th November 2020		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

12 - Achieving well-designed places

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	1	0
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This application is for a proposed side extension at 3 Stone Gate, Cowbit. The proposal seeks to provide a carport and an entrance lobby with new staircase which leads to an additional bedroom and en-suite above, as well as the two existing bedrooms. The ground floor of the extension will be off white render with dark composite boarding at first floor level. Roof tiles are to match those of the existing dwelling and would be conditioned as such.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is within defined settlement limits. The surrounding area is characterised by dwellings of varying ages and designs.

HISTORY

No relevant history.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

County Highways & SUDS Officer

No objections.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board

No objections.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

The proposal is for residential development on residential land within defined settlement limits. The principle of development on this land is considered acceptable.

SELLP Policy 2 - Development Management

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 2 titled - Development Management. This policy states:

"Proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to:
1. size, scale, layout, density and impact on the amenity, trees, character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development and land uses;
2. quality of design and orientation;
3. maximising the use of sustainable materials and resources;
4. access and vehicle generation levels;
5. the capacity of existing community services and infrastructure;
6. impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion;
7. sustainable drainage and flood risk;
8. impact or enhancement for areas of natural habitats and historical buildings and heritage assets;
9. impact on the potential loss of sand and gravel mineral resources."

When assessed against the above criteria the following can be observed:

1. The size, scale and layout is acceptable for the size of the site. No trees are to be affected by the proposal. The character and appearance of the surrounding area is unaffected by the proposal given the varied nature of design in the locality. The amenity of the occupants and that of the nearby residents is not considered to be impacted to the by the extension.

2. The design is considered to be acceptable for the site and the orientation is a standard front to rear arrangement.

3. The proposal does not seek to maximise the use of sustainable materials. The render is to match that of the existing dwelling and is considered to benefit the final design.

4. Access and vehicle generation levels are unaffected by the proposal as the carport does not lead to the loss of a parking space.

5. The capacity of community services and infrastructure is unaffected by the proposal.

6. Neighbouring properties shall be unaffected from noise, odour or disturbance by the proposal. The Juliet balcony window at the rear elevation is not considered to materially overlook neighbouring properties. The window directly faces the greenhouse and planting area of the adjacent business to the rear. The dwelling at 1 Stone Gate is not considered to be affected by the proposal given the separation distance of approx. 15m. 5 Stone Gate is not considered to be directly impacted by the proposal as the majority of the area to the rear of the dwelling is developed with buildings.

7. Sustainable drainage and flood risk is not considered to be materially affected by the proposal, and South Holland Internal Drainage Board have no objections to the proposal.

8. Natural habitats, historical buildings and heritage assets are unaffected by the proposal.

9. Sand and gravel mineral resources are unaffected by the proposal.

When assessed against the above criteria the proposal is considered to accord with Policy 2 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.

SELLP Policy 3 - Design of New Development

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 3 titled - Design of New Development. This policy states:

All development will create distinctive places through the use of high quality and inclusive design and layout and, where appropriate, make innovative use of local traditional styles and materials. Design which is inappropriate to the local area, or which fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area, will not be acceptable.
Development proposals will demonstrate how the following issues, where they are relevant to the proposal, will be secured:
1. creating a sense of place by complementing and enhancing designated and non designated heritage assets; historic street patterns; respecting the density, scale, visual closure, landmarks, views, massing of neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area;
2. distinguishing between private and public space;
3. the landscape character of the location;
4. accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways;
5. the provision of facilities for the storage of refuse/recycling bins, storage and/or parking of bicycles and layout of car parking;
6. the lighting of public places;
7. ensuring public spaces are accessible to all;
8. crime prevention and community safety;
9. the orientation of buildings on the site to enable the best use of decentralised and renewable low-carbon energy technologies for the lifetime of the development;
10. the appropriate treatment of facades to public places, including shop frontages to avoid visual intrusion by advertising, other signage, security shutters, meter boxes and other service and communication infrastructure;
11. residential amenity;
12. the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resistant and flood-resilient design and sustainable drainage systems (SuDS);
13. the use of locally sourced building materials, minimising the use of water and minimising land take, to protect best and most versatile soils;
14. the incorporation of existing hedgerows and trees and the provision of appropriate new landscaping to enhance biodiversity, green infrastructure, flood risk mitigation and urban cooling;
15. the appropriate use or reuse of historic buildings.

When assessed against the above criteria the following can be observed:

1. The proposal respects historic street patterns as well as the density and scale of dwellings in the surrounding area. Views are unaffected by the proposal, which is considered to accord with massing of neighbouring dwellings.

2. The proposal distinguishes between private and public space.

3. The landscape character of the location is unaffected by the proposal as the surrounding area is a mixture of dwellings of varying ages and design.

4. The proposal site is within the centre of Cowbit and is well connected to public footpaths and bus routes.

5. The storage of recycling bins and cycles is unaffected by the proposal. The proposal provides 2 off road parking spaces which accords with the minimum number requested by Appendix 6 of the SELLP for dwellings of 3 bedrooms or fewer.

6. The lighting of public spaces is unaffected by the proposal.

7. Public spaces are unaffected by the proposal.

8. The proposal does not impact crime prevention or community safety.

9. As the extension is to an existing dwelling the orientation cannot be such to facilitate low carbon technologies.

10. The proposal is for an extension to a residential dwelling so signage, facades and other similar design elements are not impacted.

11. Residential amenity is not considered to be materially impacted by the proposal. The Juliet balcony window at the rear elevation is not considered to materially overlook neighbouring properties. The window directly faces the greenhouse and planting area of the adjacent business to to the rear. The dwelling at 1 Stone Gate is not considered to be affected by the proposal given the separation distance of approx. 15m. 5 Stone Gate is not considered to be directly impacted by the proposal as the majority of the area to the rear of the dwelling is developed with buildings and the extension will project from the elevation on the opposite side to that dwelling.

12. Sustainable drainage and flood risk is not considered to be materially affected by the proposal, and South Holland Internal Drainage Board have no objections to the proposal.

13. The proposal does not seek to maximise the use of local resources, however, the render and tiling is designed to match that of the existing dwelling. This is considered to benefit the proposal as a whole.

14. Landscaping is not considered be impact by this proposal.

15. The dwelling whilst fairly old is not considered to constitute a historical building. Additionally, it is already in residential use.

The proposal is considered to accord with Policy 3 of the SELLP.

CONCLUSION

The proposal accords with Policies 1, 2, 3, 36 and Appendix of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

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.