

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H09-0966-19 **Applicant:** Mr A Keates
Proposal: First floor side extension
Location: 6 Netherfield Holbeach Spalding
Terminal Date: 20th November 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	0	0	0
RESIDENTS	0	1	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application that seeks permission for first floor side extension to the property at 6 Netherfield, Holbeach, Spalding.

Site Description

The site is within the suburbs of the historical town of Holbeach. The area was a major urban extension approved in early 1980s. Netherfield is a minor access road that links Spalding Road to

the north and Hall Gate to the south. From it, there are cul-de-sac streets that serves access to further houses. A well-defined frontage development comprising detached houses is on each side of Netherfield.

The property in question is set back further from the carriageway. There is a footpath and wide verge along the curve of Netherfield. The property is a two-storey 'brick-and-tile' house. There is a conservatory with brick base on the rear elevation and a patio. The remainder of the site is a fairly spacious domestic garden laid to lawn. A nearly 2 metre timber close board with higher mature leylandii in adjacent land conceal significantly the rear garden.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Members of public

One representation has been received advising that the proposal should remain as is with no fenestration on the northern side elevation. Otherwise, overlooking effect would be likely.

Holbeach Parish Council

One representation has been received supporting the proposal.

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. As such, there is no objection to the principle of ancillary development to the main dwelling. The key policy issues therefore relate to the material considerations mentioned below.

Design and layout

The proposed extension would be developed above what would have originally been an attached garage on the northern side elevation of the house. The extension would accommodate two bedrooms further.

The extension footprint would be tantamount to the footprint of the former garage. The ridge height would be up to the ridgeline of the existing house roof. In doing so, the extension would be commensurate with the host property in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

A gable pitch would be created on the front elevation as a subservient form to the existing two-storey gable pitched element. The facing brickwork, roof tiles and opening material would match those existing in the house. Overall, the development would be well designed in relation to the hosting property as well as the wider street scene.

Residential amenity

The material increase of the extension upwards would not create any detrimental impact on the nearest adjacent property No. 8 to the north. The opposing elevation has no upper windows and a 1.60 metre separation distance would be provided with the boundary line which is deemed in this case sufficient to avoid any adverse overbearing or overlooking impact to the neighbours. The amenity standards of residents nearby would not result adversely affected in account of the proposed development.

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 and 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.