

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H04-0298-23 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Firth
Proposal: Proposed two storey side extension and removal of chimney
Location: 60 Northorpe Road Donington Spalding
Terminal Date: 10th July 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	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

Proposal is for a two-storey, side extension at 60 Northorpe Road. The development would measure approximately 6000mm (depth) by 5800mm (width). The proposed height would be in line with the existing house, with the new section featuring a hip roof, blending the roof line of the host to the extension. The height of the extension would be, approximately, 4100mm to the eaves and 6300mm to the peak. All materials are to match the host. An additional bedroom would be created.

Site Description

The site is not within any settlement boundaries outlined within the South-East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP), instead lying approximately 600 metres north of Donnington. The property is part of a linear form of sparse, residential development, stretching north from Donnington along Northorpe Road. To the north and west are residential properties. To the south and east is agricultural land. On the north-eastern boundary is a separate, commercial storage unit.

The property is slightly older in appearance than its counterparts to the north. Also contrary to its northern neighbours, is the property's white rendering.

The property is within Flood Zone 1 of the Environment Agency flood risk maps.

Relevant History

H04-0344-97 - Erect two storey extension to end of existing cottage. Approved 13/05/97.

Consultation Responses

Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority

No objection as the works will have no impact on surface water flood risk or highway safety.

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 proposed scale of development, while significant, would not be out of proportion to the existing property. All heights would match the existing property, ensuring a visual continuity of design.

All materials and fittings would match the host dwelling. This would ensure that the new extension would be well incorporated into the original dwelling and prevent visual dissonance.

The incorporation of the roof design into the host, to form a large, hipped roof would further aid in the development appearing well blended into the host.

The proposal, therefore, conforms to Policy 2 of the SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF in terms of design.

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 proposal would create limited amenity concerns.

It is proposed that the extension would be on the eastern side of the properties. This means that the extension would face away from any neighbouring dwellings, preventing any overshadowing or overlooking.

There is significant distance between the proposed extension and any neighbouring residences. This, coupled with the eastern orientation, would ensure that no overlooking or overshadowing is created by the proposed extension.

The proposal therefore conforms to Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP in terms of residential amenity.

Parking and Highways

The proposal would create an additional bedroom, bringing the total bedrooms from three to four. In line with Policy 36 and Appendix 6 of the SELLP, parking for three cars must be accommodated within the residential curtilage.

The property features sufficient parking space, with a sizeable driveway that can be used for turning. As such, an additional vehicle could be accommodated, while still offering ample room for manoeuvring.

The proposal therefore conforms to Policy 36 and Appendix 6 of the SELLP.

Planning Balance

The proposal conforms to Policy 2 of the SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF in terms of design. The incorporation of the proposed roof into the existing property, together with the use of consistent materials, would ensure that the extension appears well blended into the fabric of the dwelling.

The proposal also conforms to Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP in terms of amenity impact. It is expected that there would be no overshadowing or overlooking as a result of the development due to the significant separation distance and the orientation of the proposal.

The required additional parking space can easily be accommodated within the curtilage of the property. As such the proposal conforms to Policy 36 and Appendix 6 of the SELLP in terms of parking standards.

The relevant consultee from the Highway department has raised no objections, stating that the works will have no impact upon highway safety or surface water flooding.

For the above reasons, the planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

The recommendation is for 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.