DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H16-0006-20**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs S Rodgers**
Proposal:	Rear extension and alterations		
Location:	33 West Parade Spalding		
Terminal Date:	3rd March 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 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder application for a rear extension and alterations at 33 West Parade, Spalding. The proposal projects 6.7 metres from the original rear wall and is 7.1 metres in width. The flat roof is 3.1 metres in height and a 3.85 metre roof lantern height. Walls are slate grey Marley Cedral Cladding with UPVC Anthracite Grey Windows. The extension will house a relocated and extended kitchen. An existing store and pantry projection to the side and rear of the building is to be removed to facilitate this development.

Site Description

The proposal is within defined settlement limits and the surrounding area is characterised by semi-detached dwellings of a similar age and design.

History

None

Consultation Responses

None

Planning Considerations

- Principle of development

Principle of development

The proposed is within defined settlement limits and does not take up a sizeable amount of the available curtilage. The design of the proposal is such is that there is not considered to be a material overlooking or overshadowing impact. The proposed materials are not considered to impact on the character of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. There is not considered to be an impact from the proposed French doors they area sited at ground floor level and will serve a kitchen so it is not considered this will impact the amenity of the property or neighbouring dwellings.

Conclusion

In light of the above considerations the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

A delegated approval is considered to be appropriate.

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.