DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H02-1005-20**	**Applicant:**	**K Lang**
Proposal:	First floor extension above garage including alterations and extension to connect garage to existing dwelling		
Location:	7 Crawford Gardens Crowland Peterborough		
Terminal Date:	26th January 2021		

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	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder application seeking permission for a proposed first floor extension above garage, including alterations and an extension to connect the garage to the existing dwelling at 7 Crawford Gardens, Crowland.

Site Description

The property is a detached dwelling situated within the cul-de-sac of Crawford Gardens. The property sits within a spacious plot, which has a detached garage, large gravelled driveway and a grassed front garden, with mature hedging to the front boundary as the boundary treatment. There is access to the rear garden in between the dwelling and the garage. The dwellings in the area are

of a similar age and design.

History

No planning history relevant.

Consultation Responses

No consultation responses.

Planning Considerations

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting; and 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, among other considerations. 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 proposed first floor extension will follow the footprint of the existing garage and connect to the northern elevation of the property. The ridge height would be approx. 1m lower than the existing dwelling. At ground floor, a small monopitched extension would protrude approx. 1.5m from the front elevation. Having regard to the existing dimensions of the house, the proposals are acceptable in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

A gable pitch roof will be formed on top of the proposed first floor extension. The proposed front elevation windows to the first floor will be a dormer style with a gable pitched roof. The proposed roof structure will match the original build accordingly and compliments the overall character of the property.

Facing brickwork on walls, concrete roof tiles and UPVC in fenestration and rainwater goods will match those existing in the property. Thus, the development will appear well blended with the fabric of the house and the visual amenity will not result undermined.

Internally, the purpose of the development is to gain further internal floor space for enlarging and creating new rooms inside the house. This includes creating an additional master bedroom with a walk in wardrobe and a large ensuite bathroom to the first floor. The ground floor garage will stay as a garage, but will be wider. Overall, the proposals will ensure good living conditions of the house occupiers and are in keeping with the residential use of the property.

Taking the above into account, the proposed extensions are deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in terms of layout, design, size and scale.

Parking Provision

In connection with Policy 36 of SELLP 2019, Appendix 6 sets out the minimum requirements for car parking provision. 3 no. car spaces must be provided within the curtilage for dwellings with more than 3 no. bedrooms. The drive to the front is clearly sufficient to accommodate these cars and enter and egress in a safe and forward manner.

Therefore, the proposals will ensure appropriate car parking provision is adequate and complies with Appendix 6 of SELLP 2019.

Protected Trees

The protected trees to the north of the site will not be adversely impacted by the proposed extensions. The bulk of the proposed works will utilise the existing garage foundations. There will only be a small protrusion to the front of the garage at ground floor, which will be no closer to the protected trees than the existing garage.

The proposal therefore complies with Policy 28 in this regard.

Impacts upon Residential Amenity

The proposed windows on both the front and rear walls of the two-storey extension will not overlook unacceptably to any residential plot neither habitable rooms of other dwellinghouses. There is no property directly opposite the front elevation and the property to the rear is approx. 33m away from the proposed extension. No openings will be created on the side and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of overlooking.

Given the separation distances with neighbouring properties to the north and west (approx. 25m and 33m away respectively, it is not considered that there would be a material overshadowing or overbearing impact.

Taking the above into account, the proposed extensions are deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in terms of residential amenity.

Planning Balance

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, states that the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposal does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, protected trees or amenity of nearby residents. It is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 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.

Conclusion

The recommendation is therefore for a delegated approval.