DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H02-0362-23**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs A Coates**
Proposal:	Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension		
Location:	Sycamore House 2 Beechcroft Gardens Crowland		
Terminal Date:	13th June 2023		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
NORTH LEVEL INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder application seeking permission for the demolition of an existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension. The development is proposed at Sycamore House, 2 Beechcroft Gardens. The extension will measure approximately 3900mm in height and 7400mm in width.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Crowland, as outlined within the South-East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP). It is to the South of Crowland, approximately 100 metres from the edge of the settlement boundary. The dwelling is down a narrow private drive coming off of Low Road which leads to 3 other houses. The surrounding dwellings are all built similarly to one another in terms of brick type and design, with white UPVC frames.

History

H02-0908-92 - Approved - Residential Development

H02-0146-96 - Approved on 02-04-96 - Residential Development (renewal of application H02-0908-92)

H02-0476-01 - Approved on 20-09-01 - Residential development for 4 dwellings

H02-0416-04 - Approved on 01-07-04 - Erection of four detached dwellings and garages.

Consultation Responses

Crowland Parish Council

No objections.

North Level Internal Drainage Board

No observations to make.

Planning Considerations

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2021 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, that they are visually attractive, as a result of good architecture, and are sympathetic to local character. Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP, states that 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.

The dimensions of the proposal are considered to be proportionate to the dwelling. The height of the extension will be at a similar level to what the existing conservatory is already at, given this it is not considered that the development will be over bearing in relation to the existing dwelling. The width will be slightly longer on both sides coming up level to the western side of the house matching the distance to the existing boundary fence.

The proposed design will be in keeping with the existing dwelling and wider area including the other dwellings on Beechcroft Gardens, they will be using matching brickwork to that of the existing dwelling with white uPVC windows and a tile pitched roof which also match the dwelling. This ensures that the proposed development blends in with the house and therefore doesn't create any visual discrepancies.

The existing French doors will be replaced by white uPVC windows facing the rear, there is also an external door on the east side which is being replaced by French doors which will open up into the rear garden area.

Internally they are altering the layout of the kitchen to involve it with the extension. The kitchen will be opened up into the proposed garden room to make it open plan and provide them with more floor space in this specific area.

Based on this the rear extension will comply with Policies 2 & 3 and Section 12 of the NPPF for the design, layout, and impact upon the local area.

Impacts Upon Resident Amenity

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF amongst other matters, seeks places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP set out residential amenity and relationship to existing development and land uses as main considerations when making planning decisions.

The dwelling has properties either side of it, there is a boundary distance of 1700mm to No.1 (to the west) and 9050mm boundary distance to No.3 (to the east) both measurements coming from the distance to the proposed extension.

No. 1 is situated slightly forward of No. 2 and therefore will face no impacts from overlooking as it is approximately 17m away from the proposal. No. 3 is level with the existing dwelling however the boundary is further away from the proposal and therefore will face no impacts with overlooking or overshadowing. Due to the height of the proposal, these properties will face minimal impact regarding overlooking or overshadowing especially considering the distance from them to the proposal itself.

There is a distance of 74650mm to the rear fence with no houses backing onto this, therefore there is no concerns regarding overlooking or over shadowing to the rear.

Based on this, the proposal will follow Paragraph 130 of the NPPF and both Policy 2 & 3 of the SELLP.

Planning Balance

The proposal will not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality or the amenity of nearby residents and will therefore conform to Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF.

The planning balance is therefore considered to be in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

The recommendation is for 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.