

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H13-1076-19 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs L Silvester
Proposal: Proposed extension and alterations
Location: 4 Hatt Close Moulton Spalding
Terminal Date: 27th January 2020

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	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application that seeks permission for proposed extension and alterations to the property at 4 Hatt Close, Moulton, Spalding.

The proposed works comprise of one first-floor extension and one single-storey rear/side extension. Alterations range from internal walls to new openings on the external elevations.

Site Description

The site is located in the village of Moulton on a residential estate. The houses are detached two-storey with attached garage mostly within rectangular plots. The application site extends at the back

of the plots of No. 28 to 32 Bell Lane and No. 2 Hatt Close which are found to the east. The adjacent house No. 6 to the west is set back further from the principal elevation of the application property. A 1.8 metre high timber close board fence obscures views from the aforementioned houses to the site.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Moulton Parish Council

No objection.

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Moulton as set out in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. There is no objection to the principle of house extensions which are by nature part of the main dwelling and therefore no sequential approach should be applied. Thus, the key policy issues relate to the material considerations addressed below.

Layout and design

The first-floor extension would be located above the existing single-storey element extending along the western side elevation and rear elevation. The roof would cover the full depth of the extension forming a gable end facing No. 6. The eaves would be as much as those existing in the house and the ridge height would be tantamount to the ridgeline of the main roof.

The longest protrusion of the single-storey rear/side extension would be approximately 5 metres from the original rear wall of the building. The extension would also project marginally from the eastern side elevation. The roof would be flat and the total height 3 metres. Having regard to the dimensions of the house, the proposal would be subservient with the host property in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

The purpose of the extension is to increase internal floorspace for additional bedroom and conversion of single bedroom into double on the first floor level. The kitchen would be relocated and merged with a new family room to the eastern part of the ground floor level. The aim of the proposal responds to the residential needs of the house occupiers.

The layout of the gable pitched roof on the first-floor extension and flat roof on the rear/side extension would provide a sense of scale and hierarchy to the development in relation with the host property. The external walls of the extensions would be made of facing brickwork matching the existing one in the house. Likewise, the roof tiles and windows would be of similar appearance. The visual amenity therefore would not result undermined.

Residential amenity

The height of the single-storey extension would not have any impact upon the amenity of adjacent residents to the east. These neighbouring houses are greatly set back from the proposed extension and the existing boundary treatment would screen most of the bulk of the development on that part of the building.

With regards to the first-floor extension, there would be approximately 1.75m separation distance with the opposing elevation on the garage at No. 6 to the west. The bulk of this extension would not cause any overbearing impact upon the residents living at No. 6 given that No. 4 is set further forward. No upper window opening is proposed on the western elevation. Given the position of both houses within the sun path, no overshadowing would occur. For these reasons, the proposal would not harm the amenity standards for the occupiers of the property as well as the residents in adjacent properties.

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 Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019.

No objections have been received. 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.