

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H13-1203-19 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs R Lacey
Proposal: Extension and alterations
Location: 42 Roman Road Moulton Chapel Spalding
Terminal Date: 11th February 2020

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02 Development Management
03 Design of New Development
36 Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6 Parking Standards

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
IAN MARSHMAN, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder application at 42 Roman Road, Moulton Chapel. The proposal is to extend to the front and rear of the property, with alterations to the internal space.

Site Description

The property at 42 Roman Road is within the settlement boundary of Moulton Chapel, according to the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.

It is situated to the east of Moulton Chapel, on the north side of Roman Road. The site is situated between two bungalows of a similar design and several bungalows opposite with a similar design as well.

The property is set back from the road, with mature hedging boundary treatment to the front and to the sides of the property.

The property has a large grassed front garden, with a concrete driveway to the side of the bungalow, which can accommodate 2 cars.

History

No historic applications.

Consultation Responses

LCC Historic Environment Officer - No archaeological impact.

Moulton Parish Council - Support.

Planning Considerations

Size and Scale

There will be a flat roof extension to the rear of the dwelling, which will incorporate a roof lantern. This will be extending out to the rear by approx. 3.7m and 5.1m in width. The proposed rear extension is approx. 4.3m from the boundary to the north and a good proportion of the rear garden would be retained.

The extension off the front elevation of the dwelling will project approx. 4.2m and be approx. 5.3m in width. The property has a large front garden which can satisfactorily accommodate this extension.

Therefore the size and scale of the proposed development is considered acceptable.

Layout and Design

The proposed development will create a larger kitchen and utility room, with an additional dining area to the rear of the dwelling.

The extension to the front of the property, will extend off of what was the lounge. This will be changed to an additional bedroom with the proposed extension being transformed to a new lounge area.

A flat roof rear extension is acceptable due to it being situated to the rear of the property. This means that it will not be visible from the front of the property thus not impacting upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The proposed front extension incorporates a similar roof design (front gable) to the property situated to the west of the dwelling. Furthermore, frontage properties are on a varied building line and there is hedging to the front of the property thus meaning that it would not be obtrusive in the street scene.

Given the above, the impact from the proposed layout and design of the area is deemed acceptable.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

Both extensions are single storey in nature and the host property is adjoined by bungalows. Furthermore, the closest part of the adjacent property to the proposed rear extension is a garage. Therefore there should be no overlooking or overbearing impact.

To the front of the property, the extension to the lounge will provide an additional bedroom. The new window will be in the same position as the existing and will not be impacted by residential amenity due to the screening of the mature hedging treatment boundary that it to the front of the property. Taking into account the path of the sun, the front extension should not have a material adverse impact on light to neighbouring properties.

Therefore the proposed development will not have an adverse impact upon the standards of residential amenity.

Additional Considerations

Conclusion

In light of the considerations above, the proposed extensions and alterations to 42 Roman Road, Moulton Chapel, is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

The recommendation is therefore for a delegated approval.

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.