

## DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

**Application No:** H01-0895-19      **Applicant:** Mr P Coupland  
**Proposal:** Proposed single-storey rear extension  
**Location:** 5 Stone Gate Cowbit Spalding  
**Terminal Date:** 1st November 2019

### Planning Policies

#### South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02                      Development Management  
03                      Design of New Development

#### National Guidance

#### National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 12: Achieving well-designed places

### Representations:

|                                                  | Object | Support | No Obj. | Comments |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|----------|
| PARISH COUNCIL                                   | 0      | 1       | 0       | 0        |
| WARD MEMBER                                      | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0        |
| IAN MARSHMAN,<br>HISTORIC<br>ENVIRONMENT OFFICER | 0      | 0       | 0       | 1        |

### CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

#### Proposal

This is a householder application for a proposed single-storey rear extension, at 5 Stonegate Cowbit.

#### Site Description

The host property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling, which has a driveway to the east of the dwelling, which can be accessed from the main road.

The front of the property is set on the main road, with a public footpath along the front. There are a variety of two-storey dwellings in the area.

The attached dwelling to the west is of a white rendering, whereas the host property is a red brick design, so varieties of housing designs are typically seen in this area. There does not appear to be any treatment boundaries around the front of the property, due to it being close to the main road. The entrance door is situated to the side of the property.

## **History**

None relevant.

## **Consultation Responses**

Cowbit Parish Council in Support of this planning application.

Ian Marshman, Historic Environment Officer at Lincolnshire County Council confirms that there is no archaeological impact.

## **Planning Considerations**

### **Size and scale**

The size of the extension is in proportion with the host property and the plot is large enough to accommodate the proposed extension. The extension projects approx. 3m from the rear elevation and it comes out as far as the existing side extension. Overall it would 'round off' the ground floor. The extension would be approx. 3.4m from the boundary, so there is still accessible space for a parked car and the driveway is not affected by this development.

### **Layout and Design**

The proposed extension is in keeping with the existing character of the host dwelling in terms of materials. The rear extension is proposed as a flat roof extension to accommodate another bedroom to the rear of the property. The flat roof could potentially be seen from the front, but not enough to impact upon the character of the area. The layout and design is therefore considered acceptable.

### **Impacts upon Residential Amenity**

This development will not have a material adverse impact on residential amenity due to the size and positioning of the extension as well as the extension being single storey.

Furthermore, there are no windows situated on the eastern elevation of the proposed extension meaning that there should be no issues of overlooking beyond the windows that presently exist on this elevation. The existing boundary treatment (trees) also screen views in this direction.

There is a rear French patio door which is proposed, which is to face towards the large rear garden, creating an easy access into the rear garden for the residents.

## **Conclusion**

In light of the considerations above, the proposal for a single storey rear extension is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and of Section 12 in the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

The recommendation is therefore a delegated approval.

## **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.