

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H11-0813-19 **Applicant:** Mr and Mrs P Denwood
Proposal: Rear extension and alterations
Location: 43 Lancaster Drive Long Sutton Spalding
Terminal Date: 11th November 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 that seeks permission for rear extension and alterations to the property at 43 Lancaster Drive, Long Sutton, Spalding.

Site Description

The area is purely residential. Lancaster Drive is a cul-de-sac street with a frontage development on each side of the highway comprising detached houses within spacious rectangular plots. The application site is wider than most of the residential plots in the area. The dwelling is a bungalow with spacious garden laid in grass. The amenity area extends to the rear and east part of the site. The Fall Drain runs adjacent to the eastern boundary. A nearly 2 metre high timber close

board fence is on the western boundary. The neighbouring property beyond this fence is also a hip roofed bungalow.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

None.

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. There is no objection to the principle of a house extension incorporating ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling. The nature of the development outweighs any other consideration with regards to the local spatial strategy contained in Policy 1 of SELLP. The key policy issues of this proposal therefore relate to the material considerations mentioned below.

Design and layout

The extension would protrude approximately 5 metres from the main rear wall of the property. It would measure approximately 4.30 metres in width and 4 metres in maximum height. Having regard the dimensions of the bungalow, the proposal therefore would be subservient to the main property in terms of scale, mass and height.

The floor plans show that the house extension seeks to increase the internal floor space to accommodate a combined kitchen/dining room with snug area. This would be linked to the existing kitchen room. The nature of the proposal would be acceptable in line with the residential use of the building.

The ridge height of the extension would be as high as the central point of the main roof slope. The roof would be an open gable which would make the development well integrated with the structure of the host property. Given the spacious rear garden, the proposed extension would sit well within the site.

Residential amenity

To the west, No. 45 is the nearest house to the property whereas No. 41 is further away to the east after the drain. The separation distance between the extension and opposing elevation on No. 45 is approximately 7 metres. The aforementioned nearly 2 metre high timber close board fence falls in between. As the development is of single-storey nature, no harm upon the amenity standards of residents is anticipated in view of the existing boundary treatment and site layout.

Conclusion

Taking into account the considerations above, the proposal complies with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019 and Section 12 of 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.