DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H15-0240-21**	**Applicant:**	**M Collier-Brown**
Proposal:	Demolish existing extension and erection of kitchen extension		
Location:	The Cottage Beck Bank Quadring Fen		
Terminal Date:	4th May 2021		

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 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

12 - Achieving well-designed places

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	1	0
RESIDENTS	1	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a householder application at The Cottage, Beck Bank, Quadring Fen to demolish an existing extension and erect a kitchen extension. The proposal seeks to provide a kitchen extension that projects 2.3 metres from the existing kitchen and measures 4.894 metres in width. The eaves height will be approx. 2.1 metres and the ridge height 3.1 metres. Brick and tile is to match that of the existing dwelling and would be conditioned as such.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is outside of defined settlement limits and the surrounding area is characterised by non-nucleated linear development of varying ages and designs. The dwelling is not a listed building, subject to an Article 4 direction or located in a conservation area. The site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 and is not subject to increased flood hazard and flood depth on the 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping.

HISTORY

H15-0412-13

Full - Extension and alterations - Approved - 04 July 2013.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Councillor Walsh

No observations.

Member of the public - Objection

Character of the original cottage is being harmed.

The application wishes to run a dog agility business on the site and use the extended kitchen for this purpose.

The owner has barking dogs.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

The proposal is for residential development on residential land. The principle of development in this location is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Assessment against SELLP Policy 2 - Development Management

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 2 titled - Development Management. This policy states:

"Proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to:
1. size, scale, layout, density and impact on the amenity, trees, character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development and land uses;
2. quality of design and orientation;
3. maximising the use of sustainable materials and resources;
4. access and vehicle generation levels;
5. the capacity of existing community services and infrastructure;
6. impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion;
7. sustainable drainage and flood risk;
8. impact or enhancement for areas of natural habitats and historical buildings and heritage assets;
9. impact on the potential loss of sand and gravel mineral resources."

When assessed against the above relevant criteria the following can be observed:

1. The size, scale and layout of the extension is considered to be appropriate for the dwelling. The small extension is not considered to materially impact the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The dwelling is not a listed building, subject to an Article 4 direction or located in a conservation area. There is no discernible built character to the surrounding area and the extension is small in scale.

2. The design is considered to be appropriate for the site and is subservient in scale to the main

dwelling. The current porch entrance projects 1.2 metres from the existing wall and is of a similar height, so it is not considered that the proposed design will materially alter the appearance of the building.

3. Brick and tile is to match that of the existing dwelling and would be conditioned as such.

4. The application will not impact the existing vehicular access or vehicular generation levels.

5. The proposal will not impact existing community services and infrastructure.

6. There is not considered to be a material increase in noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion as a result of the proposal. The extension is a small single storey design which is not sited immediately adjacent any other property.

7. The site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 and is not subject to increased flood hazard and flood depth on the 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. There is not considered to be a material surface water impact. The extension has a small footprint and there is a large amount of permeable land in the vicinity.

The proposal is considered to accord with SELLP Policy 2.

Assessment against SELLP Policy 3 - Design of New Development

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 3 titled - Design of New Development. This policy states:

All development will create distinctive places through the use of high quality and inclusive design and layout and, where appropriate, make innovative use of local traditional styles and materials. 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.
Development proposals will demonstrate how the following issues, where they are relevant to the proposal, will be secured:
1. creating a sense of place by complementing and enhancing designated and non designated heritage assets; historic street patterns; respecting the density, scale, visual closure, landmarks, views, massing of neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area;
2. distinguishing between private and public space;
3. the landscape character of the location;
4. accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways;
5. the provision of facilities for the storage of refuse/recycling bins, storage and/or parking of bicycles and layout of car parking;
6. the lighting of public places;
7. ensuring public spaces are accessible to all;
8. crime prevention and community safety;
9. the orientation of buildings on the site to enable the best use of decentralised and renewable low-carbon energy technologies for the lifetime of the development;
10. the appropriate treatment of facades to public places, including shop frontages to avoid visual intrusion by advertising, other signage, security shutters, meter boxes and other service and communication infrastructure;
11. residential amenity;
12. the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resistant and flood-resilient design and sustainable drainage systems (SuDS);
13. the use of locally sourced building materials, minimising the use of water and minimising land take, to protect best and most versatile soils;
14. the incorporation of existing hedgerows and trees and the provision of appropriate new landscaping to enhance biodiversity, green infrastructure, flood risk mitigation and urban cooling;
15. the appropriate use or reuse of historic buildings.

When assessed against the above relevant criteria the following can be observed:

1. A sense of place is not considered to be materially impacted by the proposal. The dwelling is not a listed building, subject to an Article 4 direction or located in a conservation area, and doesn't appear to be of any particular historic merit. There is no discernible built character to the surrounding area and the extension is small in scale.

11. There is not considered to be a material increase in noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion as a result of the proposal. The extension is a small single storey design which is not sited immediately adjacent any other property.

12. The site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 and is not subject to increased flood hazard and flood depth on the 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. There is not considered to be a material surface water impact. The extension has a small footprint and there is a large amount of permeable land in the vicinity.

The proposal accords with SELLP Policy 3.

The owner has barking dogs

This is not a material planning concern in this instance as the application relates to a kitchen extension. This matter can, however, be addressed by the objector contacting the South Holland's Environmental Health Technician.

Future dog ability classes on site

This is not a matter of material planning weight in this instance as potential future site uses cannot form any part of the recommendation process.

PLANNING BALANCE

There is not considered to be a material impact on the character or amenity of the surrounding area as a result of the proposal. The proposal is considered to accord 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.

CONCLUSION

The recommendation is approval.

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.