

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H06-0728-19 **Applicant:** Ms E Hazell
Proposal: Proposed Extension
Location: Winford Dockings Holt Long Sutton
Terminal Date: 23rd September 2019

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 planning application that seeks permission for a proposed extension to a dwelling known as Winford off Dockings Holt, Long Sutton, Spalding.

Site Description

The site is located on the outskirts of the built-up area of Long Sutton. The setting is open countryside. Dockings Holt is a countryside lane. Winford is a large bungalow facing Dockings Holt to the east. A row of outbuildings are along the southern boundary of the residential plot. A 0.50 hectare agricultural field extends to the south-west. There is a cluster of buildings used for storage in the adjacent land to north.

Both rear and front gardens are laid to lawn, with a hardstanding drive to the front. A low picket fence is on the edge of the lane and to the front of the dwelling on the northern boundary. An approx 2 metre high timber close board fence is along the rear of this boundary. A conifer hedge bounds the rear boundary of the garden and a row of outbuilding is near the southern boundary beyond the rear of the house.

History

H06-1197-18 - Proposed livestock building - Approved

Consultation Responses

Gedney Parish Council - No objection.

No other representations had been received at the time of the consultation deadline.

Planning Considerations

Design and layout

The proposed extension would protrude approximately 2.85 metres from the northern side elevation of the house. It would measure roughly 13.1 metres in depth from the front elevation. The maximum height would be nearly 3 metres. Having regard to the dimensions of the house, the development is therefore subservient to the host property in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

Although there would only be approx. 0.25m between the northern elevation of the proposed extension and the northern boundary, access to the rear of the property would still be maintained along the southern side of the dwelling. Given that the dwelling is sited within a good size plot, it is not considered that the proposed extension would result in a cramped form of development.

The floor plans show that the aim of the development is to accommodate one additional bedroom, a study room and store. Given the scale and nature of the building, it is considered that the purpose of the development is in line with the existing.

A very slightly pitched roof would cover the extension which would mark the subservience of the development to the host property. A roof lantern would be over the middle of the study room. This element would enhance the enjoyment of daylight for the study users. Two doors have been provided in order to serve access from the house and the rear garden and vice versa. The design and layout of the proposal overall responds well to the site features, existing building and intended use.

With regards to the external materials, facing brickwork to match existing as closely as possible would be used for the walls. Glass reinforced plastic (GRP) differs from the existing concrete interlocking roof tiles in the house although both share the grey colour. New fenestration would be made of white UPVC matching with the existing windows and doors. On balance, the resulting appearance of the development in light of the proposed materials would be in keeping with the existing visual amenity.

Residential amenity

The proposed extension would be marginally separated by 0.25m from the existing timber close board fence on the northern boundary. No fenestration has been proposed on that side of the extension. Therefore, no overbearing impact of the fence upon the house occupiers would be existent.

As mentioned above, the roof lantern on top of the study room would enhance the enjoyment of daylight which would represent an improvement of the amenity standards of the house occupiers. There is no other residential property adjacent to Winford, thus no impact is made upon other residential neighbours.

Conclusion

Taking into account the considerations mentioned above, the proposed development is considered to comply with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) as well as Section

12 of National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Accordingly, it is 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.