

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H11-0321-21 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Royal

Proposal: Demolition of converted garage and construction of single storey rear extension

Location: 48 Market Street Long Sutton Spalding

Terminal Date: 24th May 2021

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
29	The Historic Environment

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (NPPF)

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This full planning application is for the demolition of a extant converted garage and replacement with a single storey extension.

The Structure that it is proposed will be demolished is a converted garage with North West Facing UPVC French doors and a North East facing UPVC casement window. The proposed extension is single storey in keeping with the remainder of the property and significantly larger than the garage it replaces, proposed to be flush with the existing North West and South East elevations of the host

property, and protrude from the gable of the main structure by 6.975m with a dual-pitched roof that continues the line of the pitch on the existent property. It is proposed that there will be a new entrance porch projecting from the North West elevation of the extension with a timber framed porch, timber-columned into a matching brick dwarf-wall. The pitch of the porch is proposed to blend into the roof pitch of the extension by way of a T-joint. The gable end of the proposal will feature a set of French doors and a new UPVC casement is proposed on the South East elevation. It is proposed that this extension will have a mixed-domestic use, playing host to a bathroom, bedroom and garden room.

Site Description

The site sits within the Long Sutton Conservation Area (LSCA), but is not at all visible from the public realm as it sits at the end of a private driveway which it shares with 46 Market Street and is shielded from roadside view by 44a Market Street. The property itself is a semi-detached bungalow, attached to a small 2 storey dwelling. Both of which appear to be of mid-C20th construction.

The area in general is characterised by residential development of varying styles and periods. However, the site is largely characterised by the large, modern residential development immediately to the North West of the site.

The proposal site is not within close range of any listed buildings or buildings of local heritage.

History

None relevant.

Consultation Responses

None received.

Planning Considerations

Heritage Impact

The local planning authority does not consider there to be any risk to the heritage values of the LSCA. Whilst UPVC is proposed in this application, UPVC already exists extensively at this site and so to refuse permission on those grounds would be unreasonable. Additionally, the site is well shielded from the public realm, to the extent that it would be incredibly difficult to view the site clearly from any public realm area of the LSCA. The proposal closely matches the architectural style of the extant site. Due to the lack of impact upon the LSCA, the neutral effect of this proposal is deemed to conserve the state of the LSCA in line with Section 16 of the NPPF.

Design and Layout

As above, the proposed design is deemed to be fully appropriate for the site due to its match to the main property and the site's hidden nature. The proposed layout is deemed to be appropriate for the proposed uses of the extension.

Residential Amenity

The proposed extension is single-storey in nature and only proposes purely ground floor new windows. Therefore, this proposal cannot be said to present any overlooking or overshadowing risk.

Planning Balance

It could be said that the use of non-vernacular materials in a LSCA setting is inappropriate according to Policy 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) (SELLP). However, the architectural style of the proposal matches the site and UPVC is already native to and proliferated within this site in particular. Furthermore, the site is shielded from public view and so any negative impact is mitigated against.

Conclusion

For the reasons listed above, this application is deemed to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 3

and 29 of the SELLP as well as Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF. Therefore, this application is recommended for approval.

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.