DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H16-0255-23**	**Applicant:**	**Mr A Machin**
Proposal:	Proposed single storey extensions and roof enlargements		
Location:	281 Bourne Road Pode Hole Spalding		
Terminal Date:	17th May 2023		

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 2021

Section 12 - Achieving Well Designed Places

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

Proposal is for a series of extensions and alterations to the dwelling and outbuilding at 281 Bourne Road. Works are proposed to the principal and side elevations, as well as to the roof of the dwelling and outbuilding. All materials and finishing are proposed to match the existing dwelling

The proposal is to extend the entire principal elevation by 1690mm. The extension will have a mono-pitched roof angled towards the front garden. To the eaves, the new unit will have a height of 2.3 metres, with the peak height rising to 3 metres. Currently, a porch, with a protrusion of 1240mm, is located on the eastern edge of this principal elevation. This porch will be removed to make way

for the extension. A large window is proposed to the west of this extension, the positioning of said window is in line with the existing window.

A second extension is proposed to the side elevation. This extension would replace the existing porch which is scheduled to be removed. The porch is located approximately halfway along the side elevation, roughly 3320mm from the existing build line to the north. The porch would measure 2340mm (width) by 665mm (protrusion). The height of the roof is identical to the proposed front elevation. Again, a mono-pitch roof is proposed.

Two alterations are proposed for the southern facing rooves. Firstly, on the single storey section of the dwelling, a change in roof orientation is proposed. This would change angle of the slope, angling the slope to the rear of the property as opposed to the side. Secondly, on the rear second-storey, a roof extension is proposed. The extension will protrude south from the peak of the roof by approximately 3500mm. The extension will be dual pitched, with a peak height of approximately 2700mm. The extension is to make room for a proposed Juliette Balcony, which will overlook the adjacent fields. A window currently occupies the site to be extended.

Finally, a roof extension is proposed to garage. An extend dual pitched roof is proposed to replace the existing flat roof. A window facing south is proposed. The additional roof space will be used as a storage area. The garage is semi-detached, connecting onto the garage of 279 Bourne Road.

Site Description

The property lies within the hamlet of Pode Hole, roughly 850m west of Spalding. As such, the site is outside of any settlement boundaries outlined in the South-East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP). The dwelling is south of the A151, (Bourne Road).

The area is characterised by a linear housing development, stretching continuously from Spalding to Vernatt's Drain. All dwellings in the area of a similar age and design. To the north is an area of industrial use. It was observed on site that a significant level of noise emanates from these industrial sites. The east and west are characterised by the aforementioned linear housing, while to the south is agricultural land.

The property itself is a red-brown brick, semi-detached property constructed in the late 1950s/ early 1960s. The roof is tiled with natural grey slate. White UPVC windows and fittings are present. The materials and design of the property are typical of the area. The porch present on site is unique to the dwelling and shows a precedent for the original build line being broken.

Relevant History

No relevant planning history.

Consultation Responses

Residents Comments

One objection, summarised as follows

Object to the vehicles parked in the driveway (not a material planning concern)
Claims the front extension will have an overbearing effect

Planning Considerations

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2021 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area. That they are visually attractive, as a result of good architecture, and are sympathetic to local character. Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP, states that 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.

All materials and finishes will match the host dwelling. As such, the potential for visual discrepancy is lowered significantly.

Taking each aspect of the proposal in turn, starting with the extension to the principal elevation. The build line has already been broken by the addition of the existing porch. Furthermore, several properties to the west already have an uneven build line. As such, the proposed visual impact of the extension would be minimal, and the development would be naturalised. While the mono-pitch roof that is proposed would also be unique to the property, it would not appear incongruous to the area. The front extension, therefore, conforms to Policy 2 of the SELLP.

The proposed side extension would again be unique to the property. However, there is an established history of houses in the area being modified. The bulk of the extension would be in proportion to the existing structure and the needs of the occupiers. As such, the proposed side extension would be in keeping with the character of the area.

The proposed roof alterations would be unique to the property. However, they would only be visible from the rear of the dwelling. As such the impact upon the street scene is minimal. The alterations would be incorporated to into the character of the property via the materials used and the alterations of the roof design to accommodate for the alterations, and therefore, would not appear incongruous.

The proposal conforms to Policy 2 of the SELLP in terms of design and scale.

Impacts Upon Resident Amenity

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF amongst other matters, seeks places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP set out residential amenity and relationship to existing development and land uses as main considerations when making planning decisions.

There is limited potential for overlooking from the proposal. The front and side extensions are single storey and any windows within these new developments occupy the same area as existing windows. The Juliette Balcony, will replace an existing window, meaning that the additional overlooking will be minimal. The balcony would face onto the fields to the south, again, reducing the potential for overlooking.

In terms of overshadowing, again the potential is low. Any additional overshadowing caused by the garage extension would fall on the adjoining garage roof, minimising impacts. Similarly, the potential additional overshadowing caused by the roof extension would fall upon the roof of 283 Bourne Road, reducing the potential impacts.

As such the proposal conforms to Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP in amenity terms.

Planning Balance

One objection one was raised, raising two points. The first regarding the vehicles is not a planning concern. The second regarding the overbearing impact of the principal extension is. Following a site inspection, it has been determined that the development would not have an overbearing impact or damage the character of the street scene. The extension would be minor in depth, being less than its counterpart on 283 Bourne Road. There are no overshadowing concerns on the principal elevation, further reducing the potential impacts. The driveway and front entrance of the adjoining property both face away from the proposed development, reducing the interaction with the proposed extension further. Therefore, while the objections are noted, they are not deemed to be sufficient to merit a refusal.

There is limited potential for overshadowing or overlooking. The proposal would appear well blended into the fabric of the house and the character of the area. The proposal therefore conforms to Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP.

The planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

The recommendation is for delegated 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.