DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H11-1080-19**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs S Watts**
Proposal:	Proposed two-storey side extension and rear dining room extension		
Location:	1 Sturton Way Long Sutton Spalding		
Terminal Date:	27th March 2020		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
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	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application that seeks permission for proposed two-storey side extension and rear dining room extension at 1 Sturton Way, Long Sutton, Spalding.

Site Description

The site is a corner plot bordering the highway junction between Sturton Way and Garnsgate Road. The area is suburbs of the historic market town of Long Sutton. The pattern of development is characterised by a mixture of detached dwellinghouses in varied scale, designs and appearances.

The property is a two-storey house with attached garage that is set at angle with the front of the property facing south.

The land between the corner boundary and the front elevation of the house is laid in gravel. The remainder of the land is laid in grass. Rail and post fencing delimits the gravel area with the grassed land as well as the site with the highway junction.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Long Sutton Parish Council

No objection.

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site is within the settlement boundary of Long Sutton as set out in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. Therefore, the principle of development is acceptable for the proposed extensions and alterations at such location.

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 considerations are below.

Design and layout

Paragraph 127 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, among other considerations. 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 as per Policy 2 of the SELLP.

The two-storey side extension would protrude 3.78 metres from the western elevation and would not project beyond the existing rear wall. The footprint would be similar to the existing external floor space of garage, toilet and utility room. The ridge of the house would be increased by approx. 55 centimetres. The ridge height of the two-storey side extension would be approx. 1 metre below the ridge of the house.

The single-storey rear extension would project 3.35 metres from the rear wall. The width would be 3.38 metres and the height approximately 3.35 metres. Having regard to the current dimensions of the house and size of the curtilage, it is considered that the development would be acceptable in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

The additional floorspace would be distributed internally as follows. Whereas the utility room and toilet will remain, a toy room and a dining room would be created on the ground floor level. An ensuite double bedroom with dressing room would be created on the first floor level. The purpose of the development would accord with the residential use of the building and would meet the needs of the occupiers.

The layout of most of the new windows would be tantamount to the existing external openings. A porch will be formed between the front and side elevation. A quoin feature will be incorporated to the rear elevation of the two-storey side extension. Both features are well regarded for contributing to enhance the design standards of the building. The external walls of the extensions would have facing brickwork match that existing in the property excepting the front section of the existing house which will be rendered. No details of the render finish have been provided, thereby a planning condition would be added to the decision notice should permission be granted. The remainder of external materials would match those existing in the property.

In light of the considerations above, the proposals would be coherent with the host property as it stands. The design and layout is well regarded. There are features that somewhat enhance the design standards of the development and by extension the entire property. Thus, the proposals accord with the aforementioned policies concerning design and layout.

Residential amenity

The single-storey extension would be set back 800 centimetres from the north-eastern boundary. The two-storey side extension would have a separation distance of 3.22 metres from the north-western boundary. There is a nearly 2 metre high timber closeboard fence on the site boundaries abutting the rear garden. Having regard to their scale and height, the proposed extensions would not create any overbearing neither overshadowing effect to the occupiers of the adjacent properties at such separation distances. It is worth noting that the existing fencing would obscure the majority of the bulk of the single-storey from No. 3 to the north-east.

The property faces straight to south so that new house extensions might lead to some overshadowing onto the adjacent properties upon their position, height and distance.

The adjacent property No. 68 Garnsgate Road is to the north-west of the two-storey side extension. The opposing elevation on No. 68 is blank and no habitable spaces appear joining this elevation. The separation distance is 3.22 metres which is deemed fairly sufficient to prevent any overbearing effect. The rear extension is single storey and projects outwards to the north. It is obscured by the two-storey rear elevation. Therefore, no overshadowing would occur by reason of the proposed development.

There is no upper windows facing the curtilage of No. 68 Garnsgate Road. At the rear elevation, there would be a small bathroom window which is not considered to undermine the amenity of residents at No. 3 by reason of overlooking effect due to the fact it would be obscure glazed. Thus, the development is designed so that loss of privacy would not occur for the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

In conclusion, 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).

Car parking provision

Appendix 6 of SELLP sets out minimum requirements for parking provision. 3 no. spaces for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms are at least required for new housing development. The dwelling would have 4 bedrooms should the proposed works be carried out.

The proposal works would not entail any substantial alteration to the existing driveway to the front of the property. The drive is sizeable to easily accommodate 3 no. cars and the layout is such that the drivers would have sufficiently room to manoeuvre the vehicles for entering and egressing the site in a safe and convenient manner. Thus, the proposal would ensure minimum car parking provision for the occupiers of the house as set out in the Local Plan.

Conclusion

Taking into account the considerations above, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019 and Appendix 6, as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPFF), 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.