DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H11-0264-21**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs Goult**
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension		
Location:	23 Gedney Road Long Sutton Spalding		
Terminal Date:	10th May 2021		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 12- Acheiving well designed places

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder application seeking permission for a proposed single storey rear extension to the dwelling at 23 Gedney Road, Long Sutton.

Site Description

The property is a terraced dwelling situated within the settlement of Long Sutton. The site forms part of frontage development on Gedney Road, which is mostly residential with a variety of ages and designs.

There is an approx.1m wide side access to the south-east of the dwelling to the rear garden. The rear garden is long and narrow, similar to other dwellings to the south-east on this part of Gedney Road. Long Sutton Primary School is to the rear.

History

No planning history relevant.

Consultation Responses

1 no. public comment in support of the proposal.

Planning Considerations

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

Paragraph 127 of the 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 that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, 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 proposed extension will protrude approx. 8m from the rear elevation of the existing utility room and shower room, with a width of approx. 3.5m. Having regard to the existing dimensions of the house and rear garden, the proposed extension is acceptable in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

As much as flat roof extensions are not considered favourable, due to it being to the rear of the dwelling it will not impact on the overall character of the surrounding area and is considered acceptable.

The external materials include a monocouche cream render, with a flat roof of single ply membrane (grey) with a roof lantern. The proposed fenestration is white upvc to match the existing. Similarly, although the rendering is different to the original dwelling, as it is located to the rear it is not visible from public vantage points.

Taking the above into account, the proposed rear extension is deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in terms of layout, design, size and scale.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

The proposed windows are situated to the south-eastern side elevation and south-western rear elevation. It is not considered that these would create an overlooking aspect to neighbouring properties due to the single storey nature of the proposal and length of the rear garden.

Given the height of the proposed extension it is not considered that it would have a material overbearing or overshadowing impact upon the properties either side.

Taking the above into account, the proposed extension is deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in terms of residential amenity.

Planning Balance

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.

The proposed single storey rear extension will not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality or amenity of nearby residents. It is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.

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.

Conclusion

The recommendation is for a delegated approval.