DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H13-0804-19**	**Applicant:**	**S Barker**
Proposal:	Proposed extension and alterations		
Location:	Laburnum House Loosegate Road Moulton Seas End		
Terminal Date:	11th October 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 proposed extension and alterations to Laburnum House at Loose Gate Road, Moulton, Spalding.

Site Description

The site is located between the settlements of Moulton to the south and Moulton Seas End to the north. It is not within any settlement boundaries according to the Policies Map of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. Thus, the site is considered part of the countryside.

The locality is characterised by scattered development comprising rural cottages and farmhouses

within agricultural holdings. The wider area consist of open agricultural fields.

Chestnut Farm is a sizeable agricultural holding which bounds the site to the north. To the west, Loose Gate Road and Wood Lane limits the site. A rural track from Wood Lane further to the east is bordering the site to the south. Laburnum House is a two-storage cottage that sits in close proximity to the junction between Loose Gate and Wood Lane. Ongoing works were observed during the site visit which relates to the approved proposal for a two-storey front extension under planning application ref. H13-0969-18. A range of outbuildings varied in design and scale are located to the south of the site. Paddock land extends further to the east.

History

H13-0969-18 - Extensions and alterations - Approved

Consultation Responses

None.

Planning Considerations

Design and layout

The original building is a two-storey old cottage. It has 'multi-break' facing brickwork and dark brown pantile roof tiles. The roof has gable ends facing east and west. The principal elevation faces south. The original footprint has a reverse L shape. A two-storey gable roofed element protrudes from the original rear wall of the building facing north. A subsequent single-storey extension with a gable pitch was carried out protruding from the eastern side wall and aligned with the front elevation. There is a fenced garden extending to the east.

The proposed development would provide an additional storey to the existing single-storey extension to the eastern elevation. The saltbox roof would remain as a style. The height would increase as much as the main ridgeline of the building. Therefore, the intended extension would be subservient to the host property in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

The external materials of the development are proposed to match those existing to the cottage. The visual amenity would therefore not be adversely altered and the proposal would be sympathetic with the rural character of the local area.

Impact upon residential amenity

The residential property of Chestnut Farm is adjacent to the north. One new window is proposed facing this neighbouring building. The opposing elevation has a little window on the first floor level although it might likely be at an oblique angle in relation to the proposed opening. In addition to that, the separation distance between both elevations would be nearly 10 metres and the new window would be an opening for the landing rather than a habitable space of the house. On balance, it is not anticipated any overlooking effect to the adjacent residents due to the proposed development. No other adverse impacts have been identified on the grounds of residential amenity.

Conclusion

Taking into consideration the mentioned above, it is concluded that the proposal is in accordance with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019. Therefore, it is 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.