

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H09-1144-20 **Applicant:** Mr S Walden
Proposal: Proposed Extension
Location: Mayfield Rest Home Fleet Street Holbeach
Terminal Date: 17th February 2021

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

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

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a full planning application that seeks permission for proposed 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. A wide range of housing types, ages, designs and appearances has been observed in the area.

To the west, a hardstanding area associated with local building material supplier Hook of Holbeach

Ltd which is currently awaiting outline permission for 6 dwellings. To the east, a row of detached dwellings. To the rear, further residential properties access from Creewood Close.

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 well-grown and bushes 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

H09-1066-06 - New porch and infill wall under existing roof - Approved
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

Holbeach Parish Council

No objection.

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 that is incidental to the enjoyment of the care home 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. 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 of the narrow porch on the principal elevation of the property. The development footprint would protrude approximately 3.65 metres. It would fill the full width of the existing porch up to 7.35 metres. The eaves would be as much as those in the building and the pitch height would raise up to 3.85 metres. The resulting scale and bulk of the development would be subservient to the host property.

The aim of the proposal is to gain further floorspace for enlarging the internal sitting room. The pitched roof would be fully glazed. The new front extension would face southwards and therefore the roof material would increase the enjoyment of daylight for the care home residents. Further fenestration and French doors onto the front garden would enhance the natural light inside the sitting room. Other external materials would be matching those existing in the building.

Car parking provision

In conjunction with Policy 36 of SELLP 2019, Appendix 6 sets out the minimum standards for parking provision upon the use class. 1space per 3 residents should be provided within the curtilage of a residential care home.

The proposed extension would not entail any increase in the number of care home residents. There is sufficient provision for car parking in the spacious drive area. On-street parking would be still prevented after carrying out the proposals which is in fact the aim of minimum standards for parking provision.

Planning balance

The principle of an extension that is incidental to the enjoyment of the care home is acceptable. . The general aim of the proposal is to enhance the amenity of the care home residents. In detail, the scale and height of the development is clearly subservient to the host property. The external appearance would match the existing materials of the building other than the glass features on the roof which is not considered detrimental to the fabric. The proposal would not add pressure onto the car parking demand and on-street parking would be still prevented.

On balance, any adverse impact of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so, when assessed against the 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 above, this application accords with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) as well as Section 12 of National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Accordingly, it is 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.