DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H09-0752-19**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs G Judd**
Proposal:	Proposed single-storey rear and first floor side extension to dwelling		
Location:	20 Meridian Walk Holbeach Spalding		
Terminal Date:	26th September 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	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	1	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application for proposed single-storey rear and first floor side extension to dwelling at 20 Meridian Walk, Holbeach, Spalding.

Site Description

The site location is within the built-up area of Holbeach. The property is part of a major urban extension of Holbeach approved and developed in 1980s. The built environment is characterised by detached houses within spacious plots. The application site is almost rectangular and facing the cul-de-sac end of Meridian Walk. The property is two-storey detached dwelling with in-built garage to the side.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Holbeach Parish Council

No objection.

Cllr Biggadike

Appears to blend in well with the street scene.

Planning Considerations

Design and layout

The first-floor extension would be above the existing garage and utility room on the western side part of the building. The height of the increase would be as much as the existing ridgeline. The rear extension would be single storey and would measure approximately 4.57 metres in width, 4.12 metres in depth and 3.80 metres in maximum height. Having regard to the existing dimensions of the house, the proposed extensions would be subservient to the host property in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

With regards to the design, a two-storey gable pitched element would be formed on the front elevation. The roof on top of the first-floor extension would be an extension of the existing main roof to the west. A gable roof is also proposed for the rear extension. Facing brickwork and roof tiles would be matching those currently in the building. The existing French doors and side panel windows on the rear elevation would be re-use and placed on the western side of the proposed extension to the rear. New fenestration would be also white UPVC with double glazing as the existing windows and doors. In light of these features, the appearance and character of the development is considered to be in keeping with the host property.

Residential amenity

The rear extension would be only half a metre away from the eastern boundary. There is currently a 1.20 metre high timber close board fence along the boundary line. Given the height of the extension, no unacceptable overshadowing neither overbearing effect is anticipated for the residents of the adjacent property No. 22. It is expected that angles of windows would be such that there should be no privacy issues with the roof lights in the proposed garden room to the rear.

The neighbouring property No. 18 is set at an angle a few metres further back from the road. The distance with the opposing elevation ranges between 3.60 metres and 8.60 metres from front to rear. A nearly 2 metre high timber close board fence is along the boundary line between both properties. The proposed development has no upper windows on the western side elevation of the application's property. By considering the proposal in these terms, it is concluded that the intended development would be acceptable since no significant harm upon the residential amenity would occur.

Conclusion

Taking into consideration the mentioned above, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 and Section 12 of 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.