

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H06-0127-20 **Applicant:** Hartlake Properties Ltd.
Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension
Location: Paynton Main Road Gedney Drove End
Terminal Date: 9th May 2020

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

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
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application that seeks permission for proposed single storey rear extension to Payton, Main Road, Gedney Drove End.

There is an existing rear extension which will be demolished in order to accommodate the proposed

development.

Site Description

The area is predominantly residential. Linear frontage development shapes the built-up area of Gedney Drove End. The site forms part of the northern frontage development on Main Road. There is a mixture of semi-detached two-storey houses and detached bungalows. A variety of designs, appearances and ages has been observed along the road. The majority of the buildings were individually designed in each plot.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Gedney Parish Council

Council support this application.

South Holland IDB

No objection.

It is reminded to contact them to comply with Board's Byelaw.

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site is within the settlement boundary of Gedney Drove End as set out in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. The principle of an extension that is incidental to the enjoyment of a dwelling house is acceptable.

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 key material considerations are addressed below.

Design and layout

Paragraph 127 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, among other considerations. 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 as per Policy 2 of the SELLP.

The proposed extension will project 8.7 metres from the original rear wall of the bungalow onto the rear garden. The width will be 5.3 metres which is slightly more than half of the full width of the building. The apex height will be 5 metres (less than the ridge height of the existing dwelling) and the eaves as much as those of the existing property. Having regard to the dimensions of the residential building, the proposed development will be subservient to the host property in terms of scale, massing and bulk.

The aim of the proposal is to increase the floorspace and re-arrange the internal rooms. The current extension hosts a lounge, kitchen and bathroom. The proposed enlargement will accommodate a large lounge/kitchen/dining room. The bathroom will be relocated side-by-side with bedroom 1. The nature of development is clearly keeping with the residential use of the building and will meet the needs of the current occupiers.

Whilst the existing extension has a high lean-to pitch facing the east and it drops gradually to become a flat roof, a hip roof will be across the full proposed extension. The new roof layout will deliver a more congruous form of development than the existing addition to the rear. Furthermore, it

will constitute an improvement on the grounds of residential amenity as mentioned below.

The external materials will match those existing in the property. Thus, the visual amenity will not result adversely altered because of the proposed works.

Policy 4 of SELLP is concerned on flood risk management and states that new development will be permitted if appropriate flood resistance and resilience measures are proposed (criterion c); incorporates the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) (criterion e); and demonstrates that adequate foul water treatment and disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development (criterion g).

Gedney Drove End has the highest flood hazard according to South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (March 2017). Under case officer's request, revised plans have been submitted to incorporate the installation of soakaway in the rear garden to manage sustainably the surface water runoff coming from the proposed extension. In doing so, the design of the development is appropriately resilient to the effects of flood risk and overall climate change following Policy 4 of SELLP. No evidence of poor soil permeability is known in the locality. In any case, the suitability of a soakaway will be tested and subsequently approved at a later stage by SHDC Building Control.

In summary, the proposed extension is deemed an acceptable form of development with the appearance of the host property and, by extension, the character of the local area. The development will function well for the purpose which has been intended. Therefore, the proposal accordingly complies with the aforementioned policies concerning design and layout.

Residential amenity

The proposed apex height will be 5 metres in contrast with 3.70 metre height of the existing lean-to. However, the lean-to element merges with the eastern side elevation where the roof is currently highest, but the ridge of the proposed extension will be instead set back 2.70 metres from this elevation and the eaves only as high as the existing property's. Therefore, any overbearing effect might be in fact reduced by virtue of the proposal as submitted.

The footprint of the extension appears 1.5 metres from the eastern boundary, 24.1 metres from the rear boundary and 8.2 metres from the western boundary. Being single-storey in nature and having a 5 metre maximum height, the development will not cause at such separation distances any detrimental to the amenity standards of residents of adjacent properties.

Therefore, the development complies with residential amenity which is one of the key principles of design and development management as set out in Policies 2 and 3 of SELLP (2019).

Conclusion

Taking into account the considerations above, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019 as well as Section 12 and 14 and of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019.

It is accordingly recommended to approve this planning application via delegated powers.

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.