DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H16-0216-20**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs M Haywood**
Proposal:	Proposed single storey front extension and internal alterations		
Location:	37 Osier Road Spalding		
Terminal Date:	5th November 2020		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

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
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
WELLAND AND DEEPINGS INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder application for a proposed single storey front extension and internal alterations to 37 Osier Road, Spalding.

Site Description

The property in question is a detached bungalow, which is situated on a fairly narrow road. The property has a large block paved driveway to the front, with a small bricked boundary treatment. The dwelling is therefore set back from the road. It has a side access to the rear on the eastern and western elevation of the property.

The surrounding area is fairly densely populated with similar styled bungalows, as well as a variety of detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings, of varying designs and ages.

History

No relevant history.

Consultation Responses

South Holland Drainage Board - Suggests a drainage strategy is formulated.

Planning Considerations

Size and Scale

The proposed extension will project from the front elevation of the dwelling (from the existing lounge area) by approx. 2.1m at the furthest point. The extension will be approx. 3.5m in width, re-using the existing PVCU bow window to the front elevation.

The proposed extension will be well proportioned and subservient to the host dwellling. Therefore, the size and scale of the proposed extension complies with Policies 2 and 3 in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.

Layout and Design

The extension will create a larger lounge for the residents. As a result, the front driveway will be slightly reduced, however there is still sufficient space for at least 2 car spaces in accordance with Appendix 6 of the Local Plan.

Materials to the external of the extension, such as the white UPVC windows and doors and roof tiles will match the existing materials of the host dwelling. The external walls are proposed to be a rendered finish, which will be a contrast from the existing brick work. However, the area is varied so there is no dominant character to maintain and it will provide a more contemporary, higher quality finish and is therefore deemed as acceptable.

The new pitch roof is to match the existing bungalow roof pitch at approximately 30 degrees. The proposed fenestration will be in keeping with the existing property.

The layout and design of the proposed extension complies with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 and is therefore deemed as acceptable.

Impact upon residential amenity

It is not considered that there would be a material adverse impact upon residential amenity as a result of extending the property. The proposed extension will involve extending out from where the original window is, which will be overlooking onto the road. Furthermore, the proposed extension is of a small scale and the distance from neighbouring properties would mean that it would not be overbearing or cause any loss of light.

The proposed extension is therefore compliant with Policy 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 in respect of residential amenity. It is therefore deemed as acceptable.

Conclusion

In light of the above considerations the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 in 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.