

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H07-0049-20 **Applicant:** Mr J Sterry-Blunt
Proposal: Single storey extension to front comprising shower room and lobby
Location: 84 Highstock Lane Gedney Hill Spalding
Terminal Date: 19th March 2020

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	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application that seeks permission for single storey extension to front comprising shower room and lobby at 84 Highstock Lane, Gedney Hill, Spalding.

Site Description

The area is purely residential. The site is part of ribbon development to the east of the built-up area of Gedney Hill. The frontage is on the southern side of Highstock Lane comprising pairs of semi-detached houses.

The row of houses stand up in lower site levels than those of the highway. The drive extends to the

front and western side of the property. It is laid in gravel.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

None.

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site lies on land designated as countryside in accordance with the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. There is no objection to the principle of developing a house extension. By reason of nature, the development cannot be located elsewhere more sustainable following the settlement hierarchy in Policy 1 of SELLP. The key policy issues of this proposal therefore relate to the material considerations mentioned 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 front elevation of the property has two levels. The lounge room (section adjoining the other semi-detached house No. 86 to the east) is set forward in relation to the hall and store (adjoining the drive to the west).

The proposed front extension would project outward 1.80 metres from the front wall of the store which would also represent an increase of 450 centimetres from the front wall of the lounge. The apex height would be 3.65 metres and the eaves, 2.80 metre high. The development is clearly subservient to the host property in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

A hip roof would be formed on top of the extension. This roof layout would be sympathetic with the hip roof pitches across the main roof of the house as well as the cat slide roof valley at the rear. 2 no. roof lights would be opened which would enhance the enjoyment of daylight in the new shower room and hall.

The finished floor levels would be raised as much as the existing in the property. Matching facing brickwork and roof tiles would be used for the development, hence the visual amenity of the property would result preserved.

For these reasons, the design and layout of the proposed extension would be acceptable in relation to the existing property as well as the built environment in the surroundings.

Residential amenity

Because of the discreet scale and bulk, and positioning, of the development, it is considered that no harm is anticipated upon the amenity standards of residents nearby. The opening of 2 no. roof lights would constitute an arrangement in the design of the proposal which would maximise the resident amenity of the house occupiers albeit in small margin.

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 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019 as well as Section 12 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.