

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H12-0374-19 **Applicant:** Mrs & Mrs Spoor
Proposal: Extension and alterations
Location: Caris Brooke Charters Lane Long Sutton
Terminal Date: 30th June 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 for extension and alterations to the property Caris Brooke, Charters Lane, Long Sutton, Spalding.

The development is a single-storey rear side extension. Two garden sheds would be relocated to the rear boundary to release floor space for accommodating the proposed extension.

Site Description

The site is part of ribbon development to north-west towards Chapel Gate, Gedney and Fleet. A cluster of properties face onto Charters Lane which goes to south. The ribbon development is

surrounded by open agricultural fields.

The properties in the southern frontage of Gedney Road and adjacent eastern side of Charters Lane are individually designed bungalows. The application's property is well set back from the lane with spacious slabbed paved driveway to the front. There is a flat roofed in-built garage on the northern-east side elevation where the proposed extension would be built.

History

None

Consultation Responses

None

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site location is within the settlement boundaries of Long Sutton as set out in the Inset Map 7 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The principle of development for the proposal is acceptable unless material considerations indicate otherwise as laid down in section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Size and scale

The proposed extension would be 11 metres deep along the northern-east side elevation. It would exceed approximately 3.40 metres from the original rear wall of the bungalow. The extension would be nearly as much as the existing garage. The height would be roughly 2.75 metres. Having regard to the dimensions of the bungalow, the proposed development would be subservient to the host property in terms of scale, massing and bulk.

Design and layout

The extension would measure approximately 31 square metres. A flat roof would be on top of the development replicating the roof structure of the garage. The enlargement of the flat roof would be appropriate given the amount of floor space which would be covering.

Whilst the extension back onto the garden would accommodate a utility room, the front part would be extended to the front wall of the bedroom next to the hall in order to accommodate a large study room. Internal alterations such as brick infill and new opening would be carried out to ensure access between the rooms and the rear garden.

The external materials are confirmed to match those existing in the host property. Thus, the visual amenity of the bungalow and surrounding buildings would not significantly altered.

Impact upon the residential amenity

A nearly 2 metre high concrete post and timber panel fence would be on the northern-east boundary in parallel with the proposed extension. A shorter timber fence in height is to the front and rear parts of the boundary. Such mixture would not represent an inconvenient to obscure views of the bulk of the extension from the site of adjacent property Tumut.

The proposed windows of the extension do overlook nowhere. No overshadowing onto the neighbouring property Tumut would take place by virtue of the position of the buildings within the sun path. For these reasons, the amenity standards of the residents would not result undermined after carrying out the development.

Conclusion

In light of considerations above, the proposed development is in accordance with Policy 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 to grant permission 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 to grant permission 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 to grant permission is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.