DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H11-1135-22**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs D McEwan**
Proposal:	Rear extension and alterations		
Location:	Beechthorne 87 Seagate Road Long Sutton		
Terminal Date:	19th January 2023		

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 2021

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 application, seeking permission for a proposed two storey rear extension of Beechthorne, 87 Seagate Road in Long Sutton.

Site Description

The site is situated within the defined settlement of Long Sutton and is a detached dwelling, set back from the main road of Seagate Road. Seagate Road is characterised by frontage residential development along this section of the road. There is a large gravelled driveway to the front of the

dwelling with mature hedging as the boundary treatment.

History

H11-0681-15 - Proposed two storey extension - Approved

Consultation Responses

Long Sutton Parish Council

There are no objections to this application

Planning Considerations

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2021 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 comprises of two storey in scale and would be located to the rear of the host dwelling. The extension would protrude from the rear elevation by approx. 5.8m, measuring approx. 6.2m in width. Overall, having regard to the existing dimensions of the house and the plot, the proposed two storey rear extension is acceptable in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

The external materials finish comprises of render to the existing brickwork and the bottom half of the extension in Limestone White. The top half of the extension would be vertical cladding in light grey. There is already white render on the dwelling to the front elevation, therefore, overall, the development will appear well blended with the fabric of the house and visual amenity will not be undermined.

The siting of the extension, when considered alongside the siting of the host dwelling, would ensure that the proposed extension would be screened by the host dwelling, and would not be visible from the highway, or public vantage points along Seagate Road. Therefore, the proposed extension, given its scale and siting, would not be a prominent or visually intrusive addition, and would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area.

Overall, the proposals will ensure good living conditions for the house occupiers and are in keeping with the residential use of the property.

Taking the above into account, the proposed two storey extension, is deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2021 in terms of layout, design, size and scale.

Residential Amenity

Paragraph 130 of National Planning Policy Framework (2021) amongst other matters seeks places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policies 2 and 3 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) set out residential amenity and relationship to existing development and land uses as main considerations when making planning decisions.

There have been no neighbour objections and it is not considered that there would be a material adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of overlooking, loss or light or an overbearing effect.

It is not considered that there would be an overlooking impact upon the neighbouring property to the south, with a separation distance of approx. 14m which is a sufficient distance away to not be affected by the proposed side elevation bedroom window in terms of overlooking.

The proposed two storey extension is not considered to be overbearing or overshadowing upon the

neighbouring amenity to the north, due to it being approx. 10.9m away from the neighbouring side elevation and would not detrimentally impact upon any neighbouring side elevation windows.

Taking the above into account, the proposed development is deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2021 in terms of residential amenity.

Parking Provision

Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP indicate that sustainable development considerations should be met in terms of access and vehicle generation levels and layout of car parking. Policy 36 and Appendix 6 set out the minimum standards for parking provision based upon the use class.

In connection with Policy 36 of SELLP 2019, Appendix 6 sets out the minimum requirements for car parking provision. 3 no. car spaces must be provided within the curtilage for dwellings with more than 3 no. bedrooms. The drive to the front is sufficient to accommodate three cars.

Therefore, the proposed parking provision complies with Policy 36 and Appendix 6 in the SELLP, 2019.

Planning Balance

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 proposed two storey extension will not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality or amenity of nearby residents. It is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.

Conclusion

In light of the considerations above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

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.