

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H03-0936-24 **Applicant:** Mr L Waters
Proposal: Proposed extension and alterations
Location: 29 Coronation Avenue Deeping St Nicholas Spalding
Terminal Date: 15th January 2025

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 December 2024

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 4 - Decision-making
Section 11 - Making effective use of land
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

National Guidance

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension at 29 Coronation Avenue, Deeping St Nicholas. The two-storey side extension would project from the south-western elevation of the dwelling, replacing an existing side extension. The proposed extension would extend the existing hipped roof form of the main dwelling.

Site Description

The site comprises land at 29 Coronation Avenue, in Deeping St Nicholas. The site features a semi-detached two-storey dwelling with a driveway at the front of the site and a garden at the rear of the site.

Relevant History

No planning applications have previously been submitted within the site.

Consultation Responses

Responses have been received from the below referenced consultees. The responses are summarised below, however, the responses can be viewed in their entirety on South Holland District Council's website.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: No objections. The proposal will result in an increase of one bedroom. There is sufficient parking on site and the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the public highway.

Deeping St Nicholas Parish Council: No response received.

Cllr B Alcock: No response received.

Cllr J R Astill: No response received.

Cllr A Harrison: No response received.

Environmental Health: No response received.

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 letters of representation have been received.

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, December 2024 (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.

The main issues and considerations in this case include the following:

- Principle of Development;
- Design and Visual Impact;
- Impact on Amenity; and
- Highway Safety and Parking.

These matters are assessed in turn below.

Principle of Development

Policy 1 of the Local Plan sets out the settlement hierarchy in respect of delivering sustainable development, which meets the social and economic needs of the area whilst protecting and enhancing the environment. The purpose of the policy is to provide enough choice of land for housing to satisfy local need, whilst making more sustainable use of land, and to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural plots by developing in sustainable locations and at appropriate densities.

Policy 1 expresses this sustainable hierarchy of settlements, ranking the settlements deemed to be most sustainable in descending order. The most sustainable locations for development are situated within the 'Sub-Regional Centres', followed by 'Main Service Centres'. Lower down the hierarchy are areas of limited development opportunity including Minor Service Centres, with areas of development constraint comprising 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. The countryside is at the bottom of the settlement hierarchy and represents the least sustainable location.

The site is within the settlement boundary of Deeping St Nicholas which is a Minor Service Centre. Furthermore, the proposal solely relates to the extension of an existing residential dwelling. As such, the principle of development is appropriate, comprising an appropriate form of development for the location. This is subject to ensuring that an appropriate design is proposed.

Design and Visual Impact

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF, states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area (including beyond the short term) and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan outlines sustainable development considerations for proposals; providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals.

Policy 3 of the Local Plan 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.

The proposal would remove the existing side extension, which is partially single storey and partially features two storeys and replace this with a two storey side extension and a rear extension. The existing extension features a sloping roofline. Nearby semi-detached dwellings on Coronation Avenue feature the same side extensions.

The street scene features mostly semi-detached dwellings. The dwelling within the site is semi-detached and adjoins 30 Coronation Avenue, which is located to the north-east of the site. The other nearest dwelling is 28a Coronation Avenue, which is a detached two storey dwelling located to the south of the site. Dwellings on Coronation Avenue feature a mixture of hipped and gable end roof forms.

The existing extension projects 3m from the house and the proposed extension would also project by 3m. The built form would however project further forward. This would unbalance the front facade of the semi-detached dwellings as the building would no longer be symmetrical. Although the proposed extension would diverge from the existing street scene, there is no strict uniformity along the street scene. As such, the proposed divergence is acceptable on balance in this case.

The positioning of the windows and doors on the proposed extension is acceptable. A front porch canopy is proposed. There are some examples of similar canopies on Coronation Avenue and as such the visual impact is acceptable.

A single storey rear extension is proposed which would connect to the existing rear extension. The proposed rear extension would measure 4.4m by 4.4m, featuring a flat roof with a roof lantern. The rear extension would measure 3m in height, which is not as tall as the existing rear extension. The scale and siting of the rear extension is acceptable.

The proposed materials would match the existing dwelling. The design and visual impact of the proposed development is acceptable. The proposal would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area and therefore accords with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that development should 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.

Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan set out that the impact of proposals on residential amenity is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

The proposed development would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing due to the positioning and scale of the extension. Two first floor windows are proposed on the side elevation of the extension, and one ground floor window. There would be approximately 10m between the proposed side elevation and the side elevation of 28a Coronation Avenue. One of the first-floor windows connects to a bathroom and the other connects to a hallway. It is considered appropriate to include a condition requiring the bathroom windows to be obscure glazed. The proposed extension would therefore not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking with neighbouring properties.

As such, the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact in amenity terms. The proposed development therefore accords with the Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan.

Highway Safety and Parking

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF sets out that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, following mitigation.

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 sets out 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 33 further reinforces the need for developments to be accessible via sustainable modes of transport.

Policy 36 of the Local Plan, in conjunction with Appendix 6, sets out minimum vehicle parking standards and requires at least two spaces for dwellings of up to three bedrooms and three spaces for dwellings with four or more bedrooms.

The dwelling would feature three bedrooms. There is enough room for two parking spaces within the site and as such the proposals accord with the parking requirements set out within the Local Plan. The proposal would therefore be acceptable in terms of highway safety and as such would accord with Policies 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the Local Plan, as well as Section 9 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk

Section 14 of the NPPF sets out guidance relating to how local authorities should assess and determine applications which are subject to flood risk concerns.

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. Policy 4 of the Local Plan sets out that development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 can be acceptable in instances where specific criteria is

met.

The application is a householder application and Paragraph 174 of the NPPF sets out that householder applications should not be subject to the sequential or exception tests. Developments should however still meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments, as set out in footnote 59.

The site is within Flood Zone 3, however, it is not within a hazard area, as identified within the SFRA. Moreover, the proposal constitutes a small-scale householder development. Consequently, there are no significant flood risk issues. The development therefore satisfactorily accords with Policy 4 in the Local Plan.

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. The proposed development is appropriate and would not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or the amenity of nearby residents. The development is also acceptable in terms of highway safety. Therefore, the proposed development accords with the Local Plan and the NPPF.

Conclusion

Taking these factors into consideration, the proposal accords with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 36 of the Local Plan, as well as Sections 9 and 12 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the benefits of the proposal; therefore, the planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be approved under Delegated Authority.

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.