DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H11-0447-19**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs Kitchingman**
Proposal:	Replacement garage with games room above		
Location:	Hall Marsh House 54 Little London Long Sutton		
Terminal Date:	24th June 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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application for replacement garage with games room above at Hall Marsh House, 54 Little London, Long Sutton, Spalding.

Site Description

The property is a two-storey Georgian house which faces onto the eastern side of Little London. It is not excessively set back from the highway edge. The front part is in gravel and bounded by a low brick wall. A wide tarmac driveway that serves vast adjacent land runs along the northern boundary of the application's site. Through this driveway there is a gate to access the rear garden of the property. The northern part of the garden is in tarmac to facilitate the access of vehicles to the

garage whereas the southern part is embellished with garden paraphernalia and partially enclosed by old 2 metre old brick wall. No neighbouring properties are immediately adjacent to the site.

History

None

Consultation Responses

Long Sutton Parish Council

No objection

Planning Considerations

Size and scale

The proposed outbuilding would measure approximately 7.85 metres in width, 5 metres in depth and 5.85 metres in apex height. The eaves would be 4.20 metres high.

The material increase would be remarkable especially with regards to the height and bulk. However, having considered the dimensions of the original dwelling and its adjacent rear extension, the intended development would be commensurate with the main building in terms of scale, massing and bulking.

Design and layout

The garage would have two storeys. The ground floor would accommodate vehicle parking space, one little shower room and a staircase to the dormer space where the games room would be located. The purpose of the development would be acceptable in view of the residential use of the property.

A side gabled roof would cover the entire outbuilding. This would replicate the roof layout of the existing garage although the gable pitch would be higher up to 35 degrees. The proposed pitch height would exceed roughly 750 centimetres above that one of the rear house extension which is nearby the garage. Notwithstanding this, such difference in height would not be detrimental to the sense of scale and hierarchy of the ancillary building to the main property.

2 no. gable roofed dormer windows would be opened on the front roof slope. These type of roof openings have been observed on the principal elevation of the house albeit with different design. The ancillary development would have a brickwork base whereas the remainder of the external walls would be rendered matching the finish on the exterior of the dwelling. Slate tiles matching those on the house would be used for the garage. UPVC and timber would match the appearance of those existing in the property's fenestration. As a result, the proposed development would not alter significantly the visual amenity of the house and its surroundings.

Impact upon residential amenity

The bulk of the proposed garage is such that it would not cause any overbearing effect to the residents of the property. The dormer windows face to no fenestration, therefore no overlooking might occur after carrying out the development as extended. A nearly 2 metre high timber panel and brick pillars are along the northern boundary which would greatly mitigate any visual impact of the garage from the ground floor level. There is no residential property immediately adjacent to the proposed garage. For these reasons, the amenity standards of the residents living in the property are not undermined by virtue of the proposal.

Conclusion

In light of considerations above, the proposed development is in accordance with Policy 1, 2 and 3 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 and Section 12 of National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

It is therefore 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 to grant permission 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 to grant permission 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 to grant permission is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.