DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H06-0766-19**	**Applicant:**	**Mr and Mrs S Moore**
Proposal:	Alterations and extensions		
Location:	Moorlands Broadgate Gedney		
Terminal Date:	30th October 2019		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
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 for alterations and extensions to the property Moorlands at Harford Gate, Gedney, Spalding.

Site Description

The site is located within the countryside in planning policy terms, as shown on the Policies Map of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The site is part of a cluster of farmhouses, agricultural fields and farm yards in the wider area. The wider context is characterised by open fields.

The site area amounts approximately to 0.43 hectares. Its boundaries define a rectangular shape

plot. The residential part of the land has been bounded by hedgerow and the plot is sizeable. The residential property is set forward within the plot, facing on to Harford Gate. Domestic garden extends to the south-east. Mature hedgerow of significant height bounds the residential plot of the site and obscure totally views onto the amenity space from the road and adjacent land.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Gedney Parish Council

No objection.

Planning Considerations

Design and layout

The existing property is a large two-storey house of rustic appearance. The circular shaped single-storey extension between the southern-west and rear elevations is considered a particular characteristic of the building. The proposal seeks to replace the circular extension with an L shape extension that would wrap around the side and rear and also to introduce a long rectangular extension which would be mostly set forward from the front elevation and extend further to the south-east.

Both extensions would have internal floor space of nearly 220 square metres. Whilst the rear extension would accommodate further space for large combined dining/kitchen/lounge, the front/side extension would host a large swimming pool area. The nature of the development matches with the use of the host property.

Despite the large footprint of the extensions, the proposed development would sit well within the site due to the large curtilage which surrounds the property and the site is well screened by existing hedging. A low pitched gable roof would be on top of the front/side extension which would be the most appropriate to soften the massing of the development. The flat roof over the rear/side extension would be acceptable.

With regards to the external materials, light grey cedral cladding would be applied on the extension walls as well as the existing dwelling. The resulting appearance would represent a substantial alteration to the existing visual amenity of the building and its surroundings. However, it is considered on balance that the proposal would not harm the rural character of the area given that the site is so well screened and the host property is not of any particular historic or architectural merit.

Residential amenity

The nearest residential properties are Plumtree House and Pulvertoft Hall, 110 metres to the north-east and 155 metres to the south-west respectively. At such distances, there would be no detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of the neighbours. Moreover, as the extensions would be single-storey the existing boundary treatment would obscure views of the development from adjacent land and the road.

Conclusion

Taking into consideration the mentioned above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

It is therefore 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.