

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H09-0543-19 **Applicant:** Mr M Sanderson
Proposal: Extension and alterations
Location: 20 Harwood Avenue Holbeach Spalding
Terminal Date: 31st July 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	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application for extension and alterations to the property at 20 Harwood Avenue, Holbeach, Spalding.

The proposed development consist of one side/rear extension and one further side extension. Alterations refer to internal works comprising wall demolition and brick infill.

Site Description

The site location is within the settlement boundaries of Holbeach as per Inset Map 5 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The area is characterised by cul-de-sac street layout and individually

designed detached houses.

The application site has a large slabbed paved drive to the front and a grassed garden fairly spacious to the rear. The property is a single-storey detached bungalow. Bungalow is the predominant feature along the wider street scene. A certain range of roof pitches and appearances has been observed. One high pitched bungalow with habitable loft space and one hip roofed bungalow are located to the north and south of the application building respectively.

History

None

Consultation Responses

None

Planning Considerations

Layout and design

There are currently two extensions to the original building. One single-storey flat roofed rear extension is aligned with the southern side wall and accommodates a sun lounge. One further flat roofed extension is on the opposite side wall used as a garage. The latter would be demolished and the proposed rear/side extension would extend from the sun lounge to the location where approximately the existing garage stands. It would not extend onto the rear garden further than the existing sun lounge. The side extension would be 1.35 metre wide, 4 metres long and as high as the elevation from which protrudes. Having regard to the existing dimensions of the bungalow, it is concluded that the scale, mass and bulking of the intended development would be subservient to the host property.

Internally, the extension would accommodate a large combined dining/lounge area and a garage at the northern part. Alterations such as wall demolition, brick infill and new openings would be carried out to connect the additional floor space with the existing house rooms. The purpose of the development is deemed to be acceptable given the scale and use of the building.

The proposed works also include re-roofing. Excluding the subsequent additions, the bungalow has currently a saltbox roof which would remain albeit a new pitch. Both roof slopes would be nearly of similar length although the slope to the south would be slightly longer. The proposed development would be a very low pitched lean-to to the northern elevation for the replacement garage. Existing materials would be matching those existing in the property. In view of these considerations, the form of development would not be unduly different and harmful from the current design and appearance of the host property.

Impact upon residential amenity

The proposed garage would be located closer to the northern boundary and would project further onto the rear garden than the existing one. An approximately 1.5m high hedgerow is on the boundary line and also tall leafy trees next to the garage.

The views from the nearest rear window of the adjacent property No. 22 to the application site might be obstructed by the garage at a 45 degree angle. Notwithstanding this, the existing trees would obscure the garage for the residents of No. 22. The garage is not prominent to such an extent to create an unacceptable overbearing effect. No representation has been received from the adjacent neighbours.

A 2 metre high timber close board fence extends along the southern boundary. Such mean of enclosure is considered to be acceptable to avoid any detrimental impact of the development to the residents of No.18.

Conclusion

In light of considerations above, the proposed development is in accordance with Policy 1, 2 and 3 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 and Section 12 of National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

It is therefore recommended to approve this 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.