DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H09-0243-21**	**Applicant:**	**Mr S Walden**
Proposal:	Proposed First Floor Extension		
Location:	Mayfield Rest Home Fleet Street Holbeach		
Terminal Date:	17th May 2021		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
17	Providing a Mix of Housing
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	1	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	1	0
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	1	0
RESIDENTS	1	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a full planning application that seeks permission for proposed first floor extension to Mayfield Rest Home, Fleet Street, Holbeach, Spalding.

Site Description

The site is within a short distance of the Holbeach historic town centre where a wide range of services and facilities are available. The area is predominantly residential. There are a wide range of housing types, ages, designs and appearances in the area.

The care home is a sizeable building rendered in white and multiple hip pitches across the full roof. It has had multiple additions and alteration to the original fabric. The property appears greatly set back from the public road. To the front, there is a front garden laid in grass and some mature bushes and trees. To the west, a wide drive area for parking.

The boundary treatment onto Fleet Road is not excessively high so there are direct views from the public road to the building.

History

H09-1144-20- Proposed Extension- Approved 17-02-21
H09-1066-06- New porch and infill wall under existing roof- Approved 19-09-06
H09-0235-02 - Extension to existing rest home (renewal of application H09/0502/97) - Approved
H09-0502-97 - Extension to existing Rest Home (renewal of application H09/0293/92) - Approved
H09-0343-95 - Alterations to Rest Home - Approved
H09-0324-94 - Extension and alterations forming three new bedrooms, w.c. and lounge. - Approved
H09-0293-92 - Extension to existing Rest Home - Approved
H09-1338-87 - Private home for old persons - Approved
H09-0916-77 - Change of use of stables and paddocks to horse riding school - Approved

Consultation Responses

Local Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority

Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.

Sue Armour, Environmental Protection Officer

No comments or objections.

Holbeach Parish Council

Support.

Cllr. Francis BIggadke

Support. More provision of social care is needed due to the housing growth in and around Holbeach.

Public

1 no. objection received, summarised -
- Sewage system is inadequate and will not be able to cope with additional rooms
- Surface water drainage is also not adequate
- Parking concerns
- Property maintenance concerns
- Property privacy

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. The principle of an extension to an existing care home is acceptable.

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

Paragraph 127 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Likewise, Policies 2 and 3 of SELLP 2019 amongst other matters seek to ensure that development respects the character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development and land uses.

The proposed extension would consist of an enlargement to the rear section of the first floor, enabling 7 new rooms with wet rooms (2 of which will have wheelchair access). There will also be an additional boiler room and a meeting room. Existing room no. 26 will be converted to 2 store rooms, therefore the net number of additional rooms will be 6.

The extension would protrude from the rear elevation of the first floor by approx. 17m, the same footprint as the ground floor. The overall width would be approx. 19.8m. The roof eaves height would match those of the existing first floor and match the existing hipped roof design. The resulting scale and bulk of the development would be commensurate with the host property. The courtyard to the middle of the building will still be open and exposed with the proposal of the first floor extension.

The proposed materials are all to match the existing. Thus, the development will appear well blended with the fabric of the house and visual amenity will not be undermined.

Surface water drainage is not considered to be materially impacted by the proposed extension as it will not enlarge the footprint of the property.

In terms of foul drainage, the proposal is to connect into the existing Anglian Water foul drainage system. Anglian Water are obliged to accept flows from new development and would be responsible for upgrading their system if necessary.

Taking the above into account, the proposed first floor extension is deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in terms of layout, design, size and scale.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

It is not considered that there would be an overbearing or overshadowing impact upon the properties to the north, with a separation distance of approx. 19m from no.1 Creewood close and approx. 30m separation distance from no.8 Creewood Close. The opposing elevation and the side facing windows of no.1 Creewood Close would appear to be to non-habitable spaces. The extension would not be visible to the property to the east.

The rear facing windows to rooms 28 and 29 would face towards the front garden of no.1 Creewood Close and the road itself. The west facing rooms would face toward a buildings merchants yard and there are intervening trees which screen views for the most part. It is therefore not considered that there would be a material overlooking aspect.

The poor maintenance of a property is not a matter for the Local Planning Authority.

Taking the above into account, the proposed extension is deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in terms of residential amenity.

Car parking provision

In conjunction with Policy 36 of SELLP 2019, Appendix 6 sets out that 1 space per 3 residents, and 1 space per 3 employees, should be provided within the curtilage of a residential care home.

The proposed extension would entail an increase in 6 residents, increasing the overall number to 34. The application form indicates there are 22 full-time employees and 12 part-time employees.

The applicant has confirmed there are approx. 12 car parking spaces within the curtilage. This is less than the minimum requirement (both as existing and taking into account the increase in residents), however, not all employees and resident visitors are assumed to be at the care home at once. There is also roadside parking available on Fleet Street. It is not considered that an increase in 6 residents would result in a material adverse impact on highway safety by virtue of vehicles parking on Fleet Street and the Highway Authority have no objection.

On balance, the proposed arrangements are considered to be acceptable.

Planning balance

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 proposed first floor extension will not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, amenity of nearby residents or highway safety.

It is considered to satisfactorily accord with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.

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.

Conclusion

The recommendation is for a delegated approval.