DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H13-1106-22**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs Moradkhan**
Proposal:	Proposed single storey rear extension and alterations		
Location:	11 Ashby Gardens Moulton Spalding		
Terminal Date:	11th January 2023		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
28	The Natural Environment
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
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	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder application, seeking permission for the erection of a single storey flat roofed extension to the rear of 11 Ashby Gardens, Moulton. The extension would projection from the main dwelling by approx. 6.6m with a width of 3.5m and a maximum height of 2.7m. The extension would have an off white render finish.

Site Description

The application site is a detached dwelling which lies on Ashby Gardens in Moulton. The site is located within a residential area and is surrounded by dwellings of varying design.

History

No relevant planning history.

Consultation Responses

No consultation responses received.

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 a single storey scale and would be located to the rear of the host dwelling. The extension has been designed as to consist of a flat roof and would project from the existing rear elevation by approx. 6.6m, with a maximum height of 2.7m. The siting of the extension, when considered alongside the siting of the host dwelling, would ensure that the proposed extension would be largely screened by the host dwelling, with only a minor extent of the addition being visible from the highway, or public vantage points along Ashby Gardens. 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.

The proposed extension is considered to be proportionate to the size of the existing dwelling and the plot. The site is big enough to comfortably accommodate the proposed extension without resulting in overdevelopment of the site and would also retain an adequate amount of outdoor amenity space.

Overall, the proposals would ensure good living conditions of the house occupiers and would be in keeping with the residential use of the property.

Taking the above into account, the proposed single storey rear 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.

It is not considered that the proposal would overshadow, overlook or be overbearing to the neighbouring properties. The proposed single storey side extension would have one high side east facing window, with bifold doors to the west elevation which would be above typical eye height. Given the single storey nature of the extension and the relatively modest rear projection, the separation distance between the host dwelling and neighbouring property to the east (minimum of approx. 2m to the boundary) is considered to suffice.

Taking the above into account, the proposed single storey rear extension 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

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. It is assumed that this dwelling has 3 bedrooms, due to the positioning of first floor windows. However, for this proposal the access and parking arrangements remain unchanged, and the drive to the front is sufficient to accommodate three cars. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and 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 single storey rear 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.