

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H16-0241-19 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs R Harrison
Proposal: Extensions and alterations to dwelling including vehicular access
Location: 12 Grange Drive Spalding
Terminal Date: 30th June 2019

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. Achieving well-designed places

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
RESIDENTS	1	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application for extensions and alterations to dwelling including vehicular access at 12 Grange Drive, Spalding.

The existing garage at the southern part of the property would be demolished to erect a single-storey extension which would protrude 3.50 metres to the rear of the property. The garage would be relocated on the opposite side of the building where another extension would be constructed. The

existing rear protrusion would be extended further out.

Site Description

The area around the site is solely characterised by residential development. According to Inset Map 2 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2019, the site is within the settlement boundary of Spalding. Therefore, the principle of development for the proposal is acceptable unless material considerations indicate otherwise as laid down in section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

The properties nearby are detached within fairly spacious plots. A variety of housing types, designs and appearances has been observed in the locality. The applicant's property is a detached bungalow which is sited on a corner plot. There is a garden area that extends to the front (east) and side (south) of the house. The rear garden is narrow.

History

None

Consultation Responses

Residents

One public representation has been received, raising the following issues:

- Loss of privacy
- Would be overbearing in nature due to proximity of extensions to boundary

LLC as Highways Authority

No objection.

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

According to the Inset Map 2 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, the site is within the settlement boundaries of Spalding. The principle of development is therefore acceptable unless other material considerations indicate otherwise as laid down in section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Size and scale

The extension on the southern elevation of the bungalow would protrude approximately 4.50 metres from the elevation. It would measure 8.60 metres in depth. The garage would project 3.30 metres from the northern side elevation and would extend 7.70 metres along that elevation. The rear extension would project roughly 1.50 metres from the original rear wall of the dwelling. The maximum height of all extensions would be as much as the existing house ridgeline. Having regard to the dimensions of the house, it is concluded that the proposed development would be subservient to the host property in terms of scale, massing and bulking.

Design and layout

The existing garage on the southern part of the bungalow would be demolished to erect a new extension which would accommodate a large combined kitchen/living room. The extension on the opposite side of the building would be used as a garage. In doing so, no loss of car parking space would occur after carrying out the development. The rear extension would enable further floor space to enlarge the existing bedroom. The purpose of the development is considered acceptable in view of the use of the building and the living needs of the occupiers.

A gable pitch facing south would be on top of the front part of the southern extension and would turn downwards to form a flat roof with a lantern at the rear. Two large gable windows would be opened. The garage extension on the northern side would be likewise flat roofed at the rear although the roofing works anticipate a hip roof to merge the extension with the main building. A gable roof would

remain after enlarging the rear bedroom.

The ridges of both side extensions would be as high as the ridgeline of the bungalow. The pitch and ridge of the rear extension would be just below the main roof. Both extensions would be equally stepped back from the principal elevation. Such arrangement would remark the sense of scale and hierarchy of the development in relation to the original structure of the bungalow.

The external materials comprising facing brickwork, roof tiles and fenestration are confirmed to match those existing in the house, thus the development would not significantly altered the visual amenity of the properties and its surroundings.

Impact upon residential amenity

The western boundary section in parallel with the rear elevation of the property is bounded by a 2 metre high timber close board fence. A mature overgrown hedgerow is however between the road and the southern elevation of the bungalow. No alterations on the boundary treatment are included in the proposal.

The separation distance with the western boundary is 1.46 metre with the southern extension and 1 metre with the norther extension. The nearest building part of the adjacent property No. 14 is a two-storey high blank elevation facing east. There is a domestic garden beyond the remainder of the boundary fence.

Due to the single-storey nature of the extensions and the height of the boundary fence, the intended development would not be dominant for the residents living at No. 14 and no overlooking would happen as there is no opposing fenestration from the extension windows.

No mean of enclosure would be along the front boundary adjacent to the road corner. There is a 25 metre long distance between the gable windows on the southern side elevation and front windows of the property No. 25 opposite the road. This is an excessive separation to anticipate no loss of privacy between these properties.

Conclusion

In light of considerations above, the proposed development is in accordance with Policy 1, 2 and 3 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 and Section 12 of National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

It is therefore recommended to approve this application via delegated powers.

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 to grant permission 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 to grant permission 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 to grant permission is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.