DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Application No:** | **H11-0482-21** | **Applicant:** | **Bancroft Residential Home** |
| **Proposal:** | Proposed Kitchen Extension | | |
| **Location:** | Bancroft Residential Homes Market Street Long Sutton | | |
| **Terminal Date:** | 29th June 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. Achieving well-designed places.

**Representations:**

| | Object | Support | No Obj. | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PARISH COUNCIL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WARD MEMBER | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| IAN MARSHMAN, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

**PROPOSAL**

This is an application for a single storey front infill extension to the existing kitchen. The extension would measure 3 metres (depth) x 5.1 metres (width) and stand at 3 metres in height. It would have a flat roof and the elevational materials would match the exiting building.

**SITE DESCRIPTION**

The property is a detached building located on Market Street on Long Sutton. It has a parking area to the south-east and private gardens to the south-west. The site is well enclosed with boundary trees/hedges. The immediate area is primarily residential comprising of dwellings of varying size/designs.

## RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

H11-0092-11 - Ground floor extension to laundry room - Approved

## REPRESENTATIONS

Historic Environment Officer

No archaeological impact.

## 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 is considered proportionate to the existing building as it would be a small infill, not extending beyond the existing front/side elevations of the building. The modest height would ensure the proposed extension does not appear overly prominent in relation to the existing building. Furthermore the use of matching external elevational materials would ensure the extension is in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling. The flat roof is not ideal, however given its small footprint and significant set back from the street it would not appear overly prominent in the street therefor it can on balance be accepted.

As such the extension would comply with the aforementioned policies on design, layout and impact upon the character of the local area.

Impacts upon Residential Amenity

Given the modest footprint of the extension, its location well within the site and the fact the site is bound by high level trees/hedges it is not considered to result in any unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

As such the proposal would accord with Paragraph 127 of National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and Policies 2 and 3 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019).

Planning Balance

The proposal will not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality or amenity of nearby residents. The planning balance is therefore considered to be in favour of the proposal.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the considerations above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (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.

## RECOMMENDATION

The application can be approved under delegated powers.