DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H13-0331-20**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs R Harrison**
Proposal:	Proposed side extension and alterations		
Location:	Holmefield 121 Seas End Road Moulton Seas End		
Terminal Date:	15th June 2020		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019	
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	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder application for a proposed side extension and alterations to 121 Seas End Road, Moulton Seas End.

Site Description

121 Seas End Road is a detached bungalow which sits outside of the settlement boundary of Moulton Seas End according to inset map no.57 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019,

and is therefore within the countryside in planning policy terms.

The bungalow is situated to the north-east of Seas End Road, from which it is set back, and is surrounded by mature trees and shrubbery, screening the dwelling from Seas End Road. In terms of character, the dwelling is a traditional brick and tile hipped roof bungalow which appears to have been extended over time, including with the addition of a Victorian style conservatory.

Existing built development in the area is relatively limited given its countryside location. There are no properties immediately to the north, south or east. There is a dwelling on the opposite side of Seas End Road, which is about 40m away.

History

H13-1195-16 - Alterations and extension - Approved- 29-12-16

H13-0412-17 - Alterations and extension - Approved- 30-05-17

Consultation Responses

Moulton Parish Council - In support.

South Holland Drainage Board - Note that no drainage strategy has been provided and reminds applicant of consenting process.

Planning Considerations

Layout and design

The proposed extension would project from the south-eastern elevation of the dwelling. It will create a large dining area and family room, including a new entrance lobby and a WC. This is in accordance with the residential use of the property.

Materials to the external elevations of the extension, including windows and doors, roof tiles and bricks, will all match the existing materials of the host dwelling. It will be joined to the existing property with a hipped roof and, overall, will be in keeping with the existing character.

Taking the above into account, the proposed layout and design of the extension is considered acceptable and in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 in respect of these matters.

Size and scale

The proposed extension would project from the existing south-eastern elevation by approx. 6.8m, replacing the existing conservatory, and would be of a width similar to the depth. This would be a well proportioned extension and, taking into account the size of the host dwelling, would be subservient in nature. The property has a large curtilage which is more than adequate to accommodate an extension of this size.

It is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 in respect of size and scale.

Impact upon residential amenity

The dwelling is bordered by fields to the north, east and south. The closest residential property is on the opposite side of the road, approximately 40m away. Taking this into account, it is not considered that there would be a material adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of overlooking, being overbearing or loss of light.

The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 in respect of their provisions relating to residential amenity.

Conclusion

In light of the above considerations, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2

and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

A delegated approval is considered to be appropriate.

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.