DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H11-0461-19**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs Hillard**
Proposal:	Proposed single-storey rear extension		
Location:	Aldabrook 37 Station Road Long Sutton		
Terminal Date:	26th August 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	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application for proposed single storey rear extension to the property Aldabrook at 37 Station Road, Long Sutton, Spalding.

Site Description

The site location is within the settlement boundaries of Long Sutton as set out in Inset Map 7 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.

The area is purely residential characterised by cul-de-sac street layout and mostly detached properties with front driveway and rear garden.

The application site is part of a well-defined residential frontage on the eastern side of Station Road that serves access to the town from A17 to the south. There is a drain on the edge of the street and the front boundary of the site which runs partially along the frontage.

Aldabrook is a two-storey semi-detached house. The rear garden is mostly grassed with a gravel driveway to a detached garage at the rear of the site. A new 2 metre high timber fence is along the northern boundary bordering the site of the adjacent semi-detached house. The opposite boundary would be bounded with a 2 metre well-maintained mature hedgerow.

History

None

Consultation Responses

None

Planning Considerations

Layout and design

The purpose of the development is to create a large combined kitchen/family area as well as a utility room with toilet. Given the use of the property, the proposal would be acceptable on this matter.

The existing lean-to element and single-storey addition both on the rear elevation would be demolished to accommodate the proposed development. The intended extension would extend the full width of the rear wall and would project 4.60 metres onto the rear garden. The development would be flat roofed and the maximum height would be 3.35 metres. Having regard to the dimensions of the house, it is concluded that the proposal would be subservient to the host property in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

The external walls of the extension would be rendered with a silicone cream coloured finish. Weather stone capping would be on top of walls. White UPVC would be used for the new fenestration matching with the existing windows and doors of the house.

A standard sized three panel window would be on the southern side elevation. A 3 section bi-fold door would be on the rear elevation serving access between the garden and the house. A lantern would be opened on the roof. Its highest part would fall below the lowest part of the upper bedroom window.
On balance, the design and layout of the proposed development would be of good standards in relation to the host property and surroundings.

Impact upon the residential amenity

In view of the existing boundary treatment and separation distances with the boundaries, the single-storey nature of the extension would create no overbearing effect to both adjacent properties.

The existing fence along the southern boundary would obscure views between the side window and those in the opposing property Sandown (No. 39). The roof lantern would be set at such an angle that no overlooking effect would be likely onto none of the adjacent properties.

The proposed development would run adjacent to the existing extension to the neighbouring semi-detached property. After assessing the location of both building within the sun path, it is considered that the height and scale of the proposal are not significant to create overshadowing to No. 35.

Conclusion

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

It is therefore 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.