DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H11-0544-19**	**Applicant:**	**Mr N Dack**
Proposal:	Single-storey rear extension and single-storey side extension to dwelling		
Location:	13 St Marys Gardens Long Sutton Spalding		
Terminal Date:	23rd July 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 that seeks permission for single-storey rear extension and single-storey side extension to the dwelling at 13 St Marys Gardens, Long Sutton, Spalding.

Site Description

The site location is within the settlement boundaries of Long Sutton according to the Inset Map 7 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.

The area is characterised by residential development in cul-de-sac street layout which show that this is suburban extension to the historic town. The houses are detached and individually designed

standing in spacious plots. Most of them are arranged forming a well-defined frontage.

The application property is a detached gable pitched bungalow by the looks of it built circa 1990s. The rear garden is grassed and fairly spacious. The plot is bounded by a 2 metre high timber close board fence.

History

None

Consultation Responses

Long Sutton Parish Council

No objection

Planning Considerations

Layout and design

The purpose of the development is to increase floor space to accommodate one utility room to the side extension and one additional en-suite bedroom and lounge room to the rear extension. The total number of bedroom would increase up to three. This is deemed to be acceptable given the scale of the development and use of the host property.

The proposed rear extension would protrude 5.50 metres from the rear wall of the bungalow. Its width and height would be as much as those of the original bungalow. Note there is a subsequent single-storey flat roofed extension to the eastern side elevation used as a garage.

The side extension has been proposed with an apex height 80 centimetres below the ridgeline of the bungalow. It would be slightly stepped back from the principal elevation. The scale of this house enlargement is discreet in relation to the bulk of the bungalow including the intended rear extension.

Overall the external layout of the development would provide a sense of scale and hierarchy to the existing bungalow. The scale, mass and bulk of both extensions would be visibly subservient to the host property.

With regards to the design, the roof of both extensions would be gable pitched which would make the development in keeping with the host property. Facing brickwork, concrete roof tiles and UPVC would match as close as possible with those existing in the property. Render would be applied on the rear elevation of the extension onto the rear garden. Further details of the render finish have not been provided. A planning condition should be imposed to require that the render would not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the property and surroundings.

Impact upon residential amenity

The single-nature of the development in conjunction with a 2 metre high timber close board fence bounding the site would be sufficient to avoid any overbearing impact to the residents of the adjacent neighbours. The separation distances between the extensions and the site boundaries would also contribute to contain the bulk of the development on the site and not create any adverse effect to the adjacent neighbours.

Conclusions

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 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.