

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H09-0115-20 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Gould
Proposal: Rear & side extensions
Location: 22 Fishpond Lane Holbeach Spalding
Terminal Date: 3rd April 2020

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01 Spatial Strategy
02 Development Management
03 Design of New Development
36 Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6 Parking Standards

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
IAN MARSHMAN, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application that seeks permission for rear and side extension to the dwelling at 22 Fishpond Lane, Holbeach, Spalding.

Site Description

The site area is predominately residential. The Fishpond Lane Nature Reserve is opposite the road. The road serves access to the historic town centre of Holbeach to the north-west.

The site is part of a frontage development between Littlebury Medical Centre (west) to Harrington Croft. There is a mix of bungalow and large two-storey detached dwellinghouses. A range of varied ages, designs and appearances has been observed along the road.

The site is long and fairly wide. The rear garden is spacious. The property is a hip roofed bungalow.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Holbeach Parish Council

No objection.

County Historic Environment Officer

No objection.

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Holbeach as set out in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. There is no objection to the principle of a house extension. No sequential approach to steer development in most sustainable locations needs to be applied in this case.

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 policy issues of the proposal relate to the material considerations discussed 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. Policy 2 of 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 as per Policy 2 of the SELLP.

The side extension would approximately protrude 2.47 metres from the north-western wall of the property and will extend 8.32 metres along the elevation. The rear extension will measure 6.3 metres from the original rear wall of the bungalow and will extend its full width.

The highest point of the side extension will be 3.70 metres and the eaves as high as those existing in the property. The maximum height of the rear extension will be as much as the ridgeline. Overall, both extensions appear subservient to the host property in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

The existing lean-to on the north-western side elevation will be demolished to accommodate the proposed extension. The internal porch will be reduced and the remainder of the floorspace will be used for a new utility room. The original rear wall will be removed to enlarge both the bedroom and living room on the ground floor. Additional floor space will be gained on the first floor to create a third bedroom. The proposed works for the internal layout are deemed acceptable are in line with the residential use of the building.

The external materials are proposed to match those existing in the property, thereby the visual amenity will not result significantly altered after undertaking the intended development.

It should be noted that no. 20 to the north-west has been extended to the rear in the same manner.

Overall, the proposed extensions and alterations will entail an appropriate form of development on the site. The appearance will accord with the host property and, by extension, will not appear at odds with the built environment in the surrounding area. Therefore, the development complies with the aforementioned policies regarding design and layout.

Residential development

The separation distance is about 3.30 metres between the proposed side extension and the north-western boundary adjoining the curtilage of No. 20. In account of its single-storey nature, this extension will not appear overbearing to the residents of No. 20.

There will be an additional roof light installed on the north-western roof slope. The opposing elevation has also a hip roof slope but with no similar openings. Thus, no overlooking is anticipated through the intended roof light.

The rear extension will be set back nearly 5.80 metres from the boundary abutting No. 20 to the north-west. At such distance, the bulk of the extension is not considered to be detrimental to the extent that it should be refused in this respect. One metre separation will be provided with the boundary adjoining No. 24. The bulk of the rear protrusion will not overshadow the single-storey rear element behind the south-eastern fence taking into account the path of the sun.

A flue for kitchen ventilation will be erected on the north-western side of the rear extension. In view of the use and height of the flue, no significant odours might potentially erode the amenity of residents of No. 20.

The property and other dwellings forming the frontage development face north-east. Having regards to such orientation, the proposed extensions will not cast excessive overshadowing onto the adjacent property No. 20.

Car parking provision

Appendix 6 of SELLP sets out minimum requirements for parking provision. 3 no. spaces for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms are at least required for new housing development.

The proposed works would entail the net increase of one bedroom up to a total of three bedrooms. Consequently, no further parking space is required and the existing provision on the driveway will be sufficient for preventing on-street parking.

Conclusion

Taking into account the considerations above, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3 and 36 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019 and Appendix 6, 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.