

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H11-0534-21 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs P Church
Proposal: Rear Extension & Alterations
Location: 13 Delph Road Long Sutton Spalding
Terminal Date: 6th July 2021

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02 Development Management
03 Design of New Development
36 Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6 Parking Standards

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 application seeking permission for a single storey rear extension to create a lounge/breakfast area. The kitchen extension would measure 4 metres (depth) x 7.7 metres, reducing to 6.5 metres towards the rear. It would have a flat roof standing at 2.8 metres (3 metres including the roof lantern). The external elevational materials would match the existing dwelling.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The property is a detached bungalow located on Delph Road in Long Sutton. The dwelling is red

brick built with white door/window frames. The property has a paved driveway to the front with off-street parking provision for 2no vehicles. The immediate area comprises a mixture of detached bungalows and two storey dwellings.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

REPRESENTATIONS

No comments received.

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 dwelling. There would be no views of it from the main public realm from the front of the site therefore no unacceptable impact would result on the street scene. Sufficient outdoor amenity space would be retained and the extension would not result in overdevelopment of the site. Furthermore the use of matching elevational materials would ensure the extension would be in keeping with the existing dwelling.

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

Impacts upon Residential Amenity

The proposed extension would not result in any significant impact on the adjacent neighbour to the east at no.9 Delph Road as the majority of it would be blocked by the applicants existing rear projecting element. The extension would extend approximately 1 metre beyond the existing rear projecting element and this is the only element that would be visible to this neighbour. This is considered to be minor, especially given the significant separation distance between the proposed extension and this neighbour's closest elevation.

With regards to the neighbour to the west at no.58 the proposed extension would be located approximately 3.4 metres from the shared boundary with this neighbour. Given the single storey nature and modest height of the extension this separation distance is considered to be sufficient as to not result in any overbearing impact or unacceptable overshadowing.

With regards to the neighbour to the rear the proposed extension would be located some 10.3 metres from the rear boundary and a significant distance from this neighbour's rear elevation.

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).

Parking

In connection with Policy 36 of SELLP 2019, Appendix 6 sets out the minimum requirements for car parking provision. The proposed scheme would not increase the number of bedrooms in the property therefore the parking requirement would remain the same. 2no parking spaces are required for the property which can be accommodated on the site therefore the scheme is considered to comply with the current parking standards.

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, 3 and 36 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.