DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H09-1043-20**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs Giles**
Proposal:	Two storey rear extension		
Location:	Rosedale Chapel Drove Holbeach Drove		
Terminal Date:	27th January 2021		

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

Paragraph 127 (Section 12. Achieving well-designed places)

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	1	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application that seeks permission for two storey rear extension to the property known as Rosedale at Chapel Drove, Holbeach Drove, Spalding.

Site Description

The site is approximately located 600 metres to the south-west of the built-up area of Holbeach Drove. Open agricultural fields predominate the locality where the site lies in.

A few agricultural holdings comprising a dwelling and associated buildings are spread across Chapel Drove. A couple of silos and agricultural buildings have been observed on the adjacent land to the south-west.
The vehicular access is on the south-eastern corner of the residential plot. The driveway and patio around the rear footprint of the house are the only hard surfaced areas. Domestic garden laid in grass extends to the rear and beyond there is paddock land with horses for private use.

Rosedale is an old two-storey detached cottage. It is set back from the highway. The dwelling benefits from several extensions. There is one conservatory on the original side wall of the cottage. To the rear, one cat slide roofed rear extension and one flat roofed extension.

History

H09-0634-20 - Single storey rear extensions - Approved

Consultation Responses

Holbeach Parish Council

No observation.

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site is out of the settlement boundaries of Holbeach Drove as set out in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. It therefore lies on the countryside. Irrespective of spatial strategy considerations, the principle of developing a house extension that is incidental to the enjoyment of a dwelling house is acceptable.

Design and layout

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; and create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users among other considerations. Likewise, Policy 2 of the 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.

The existing flat roof extension of single-storey nature would remain on the side elevation of the property. In doing so, the development footprint would project differently, specifically between 3.80 and 4.90 metres from the rear elevation of the house. The width would be as much as the length of the original rear wall. The two-storey apex would be approximately 40 centimetres below the cottage ridgeline. Having regarded to the dimensions of the building as it stands, it is considered that the proposals would be subservient to the host property in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

Internally, the extension would allow the householders to gain further floorspace to meet their increasing living needs. An additional bedroom/play room on the ground level and one ensuite bedroom with balcony on the first floor level. Internal alterations would be carried out to ensure access between the existing and proposed rooms.

The external materials of the development would match those existing in the house. Thus, the proposals would merge appropriately in terms of visual amenity and no harm would occur upon the local character of the area.

Residential amenity

Paragraph 127 of NPPF (2019) states establishes that planning decisions should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Echoing this provision, Policies 2 and 3 of

SELLP (2019) set out residential amenity as one the key considerations of development management.

The adjacent land to the north-west and south-west is paddock land and agricultural field under applicant's ownership. To the south-west, a sizeable area with agricultural buildings. No other residential properties are adjacent to the site, thereby no impact upon neighbouring residential amenity will occur.

Car parking provision

In connection with Policy 36 of SELLP 2019, Appendix 6 sets out the minimum requirements for parking provision. The minimum number of car parking spaces depends upon the number of bedrooms in the dwelling.

After developing the proposals, Rosedale would be a 4 bedroom dwellinghouse. Appendix 6 states that 3 spaces should be provided for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms within the curtilage. The size of the driveway is such that two cars could be accommodated to the side of the house and one further nearby. The residential plot is significantly spacious. Therefore, no on-street parking would occur which is the aim of the requirements for parking provision.

Planning balance

The scale and height of the two-storey extension would be proportionate with the host property. The proposed gable pitched roof will relate well with the main roof of the cottage. New external materials would match those existing to the current fabric of the property. The purpose of the development is in keeping with the residential use of the building and its setting. Given the site context, no harm would occur upon the amenity of other residents. The driveway and surroundings are sufficiently spacious to ensure a minimum of ca parking spaces after the increase of the bedroom number in the property.

In summary, no adverse impact of grating permission to the proposals would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so, when assessed against planning policies taken as a whole.

Conclusion

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.

Taking into account the considerations above, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3, 36 and Appendix 6 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019; and also Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPFF), 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.