

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H11-0715-20 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs R Simmons
Proposal: Proposed Extension
Location: 71 Roman Bank Long Sutton Spalding
Terminal Date: 27th October 2020

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
04	Approach to Flood Risk

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Paragraph 127 of Section 12. Achieving well-designed places

Paragraph 163 of Section 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
RESIDENTS	0	1	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application that seeks permission for proposed extension to the property at 71 Roman Bank, Long Sutton, Spalding.

The demolition of the current sheltered patio is proposed to ease the development of the house

extension. The house enlargement will mostly protrude from the rear elevation and also from the northern side elevation albeit narrowly.

Site Description

The site forms part of the linear development on the western side of Roman Bank. The property appears visibly below the ground levels on the highway. To the north and west, there is Maytree Drive which has a downwards slope to the west.

The property is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse. It has multi-brick facing brickwork and clay roof tiles. The detailing on the elevations and the timber porch on the rear elevation emphasise the rural character of the building. The garden is laid in lawn. Beyond the garden, there is a driveway and detached garage serving parking space to the householders.

A low brick wall and pillars bounds the site onto Roman Bank, Maytree Drive. Well-maintained laurel hedgerow supplements the brick wall onto Maytree Drive whereas dark brown timber panels are on top of the wall adjoining the driveway. Further mixture of hedgerow bounds the site onto the adjoining property No. 69 to the south.

History

H11-0965-92 - 5 No. Detached dwellings served by a private drive. Car park for 17 vehicles ass. with existing public house - Non determination

H11-0437-96 - Outline - Erection of four houses and alterations to car park - Approved

H11-1220-97 - Full - Erection of dwelling on Plot 1 with roads and sewers infrastructure development - Approved

Consultation Responses

Members of the public

One resident has made a representation regarding the proposed bricks for the development.

"Marshalls Cheshunt Multistock bricks are not made any more so need to find a match for bricks. They were semi engineering standard bricks".

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Long Sutton as set out in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. Irrespective of spatial strategy considerations, the principle of developing a house extension that is incidental to the enjoyment of a dwelling house is acceptable.

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, states that the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The key material considerations are addressed below.

Design and layout

Paragraph 127 of 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 will protrude as much as the adjoining two-storey element which host the kitchen on the ground floor level. It will extend to the north protruding marginally 80 centimetres

from the northern wall of the house. The apex height will be approximately 3.53 metres and the eaves 2.35 metres high. Thus, the extension will be subservient to the host property by reason of dimensions.

The aim of the extension is to create a large combined kitchen/dining room and utility room. The existing front dining room will be converted for additional bedroom and the existing utility room for shower room. Internal work such as wall demolition, door removal and wall erection will be carried out to ensure that there is access between the new space and adjacent rooms.

A shed roof will be on top of the extension. This roof layout is deemed acceptable given the footprint of the extension. Visually, it relates well with the high gable pitches across the elevation of the building. French doors will be installed on the rear wall onto the garden and 3 no. Velux roof lights will be formed on the roof. Such fenestration will enhance the enjoyment of daylight for the house occupiers. One single panel door will be next to the French doors to give access to the utility room from the garden.

Facing brickwork including stone window cills will match the existing. Likewise, roof tiles will be Forticrete Centurion Autumn which will match those existing on the house roof. The rainwater goods to be UPVC as the existing albeit no colour defined. For these reasons, the material schedule will appear well blended with the house.

In summary, the development is of an acceptable scale and height. The external appearance will be sympathetic with the existing fabric of the dwelling. The aim of the proposals will meet the functional needs of the dwelling occupiers and the use of the development will be in keeping with the residential nature of the building and the character of the local area. Therefore, the development proposal comply with the policies mentioned at the top of this section concerning design, layout and impact upon the character of the local area.

Residential amenity

The house extension will be in close proximity with the existing boundary on the northern site boundary onto Maytree Drive. No other residential property is immediately adjacent to this boundary. The single-storey nature and low height of the extension will not make the extension substantially visible. In addition to that, the existing brick wall and laurel hedge will obscure greatly the bulk of the development.

The proposed French doors would face west but the next property in that direction is a bungalow and there are garages in between. Overlooking should therefore not be an issue.

In summary, the development complies with residential amenity which is one of the key principles of design and development management as set out in Policies 2 and 3 of SELLP (2019).

Flood risk and drainage

Policy 4 of SELLP is concerned on flood risk management and states that new development will be permitted if appropriate flood resistance and resilience measures are proposed (criterion c); incorporates the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) (criterion e); and demonstrates that adequate foul water treatment and disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development (criterion g).

Paragraph 163 of NPPF, 2019 states that it should be demonstrated that incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate; and safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate.

Pipes will convey surface water runoff from the extension roof to a soakaway sited 5000mm away from buildings. Foul water from the new shower room, kitchen and utility will be conveyed to the existing pipelines and eventually discharged into the main sewers.

The site has low flood risk hazard (rating 0-0.75) as per South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (March 2017). Following the Planning Practice Guidance and Environment Agency's Standing Advice, the conversion of the dining room into a bedroom does not entail an increase of flood risk vulnerability neither change of use. Should flooding have impact upon the house, the bedroom occupiers could move upstairs to safeguarding themselves in the worst case scenario. On balance, further details would not be required in this regard.

In summary, the proposals have a sustainable-based approach to manage surface water runoff by the incorporation of a soakaway. The provision of a bedroom on the ground floor level will be acceptable given the flood risk on the site and availability of refuge space at first floor. Therefore, this application complies with the aforementioned provision concerning flood risk.

Car parking provision

In conjunction with Policy 36 of SELLP 2019, Appendix 6 sets out the minimum standards for parking provision upon the use class.

The property currently benefits from 3 bedrooms. Should the dining conversion be carried out, the total number of bedrooms would raise up to 4. Three spaces for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms should be provided within the curtilage as per Appendix 6 of SELLP, 2019.

One car could be parked within the existing detached garage and one further on the driveway. There is no practical solution to accommodate further space for the third car within the curtilage. On balance, it is considered that this issue is not such an adverse impact to the extent which it should fully outweigh the benefits of the householder proposals and warrant refusal to this application. Therefore, car parking provision is acceptable in this case.

Conclusion

Taking into account the considerations above, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019; and also Paragraph 127 and 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019.

It is accordingly 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.