DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H16-0270-23**	**Applicant:**	**Mr Hofmann**
Proposal:	Extension to create new garage		
Location:	72 Woolram Wygate Spalding		
Terminal Date:	12th 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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

Proposal is for an extension to form a garage at 72 Woolram Wygate. The extension is to measure, externally, approximately 2450mm (width) by 5000mm (depth). The height to the eaves will be 2450mm, with a maximum height of 4000mm. This brings the roof inline with the existing garage. All materials will match the host property.

Site Description

The property is of significant scale, with a large double garage already attached to the dwelling to the north. The dwelling is a red brick, two-storey property with white UPVC fixtures. The area to be occupied by the extension is currently grassed. There would be between 2.3 and 1.8 metres between the extension and the low hedgerow that demarcates the boundary.

The wider area features a wide mixture of designs; however, there is a prevailing character favouring larger, two-storey dwellings. The prevailing style is contemporary in nature.

Relevant History

H16-0571-79 - Full. Residential development (65 plots) with access at Woolram Wygate. Approved 12/09/79.

Consultation Responses

No consultation responses received.

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.

The proposed extension is proportionate to the existing dwelling. The height will be consistent with the existing garage, reducing the potential for visual dissonance. The materials will also match the existing dwelling, further reducing any potential impact.

While triple garages are not common in the area, the addition of one would not appear incongruous with the prevailing built form.

The proposal therefore 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.

While the distance between the proposal and the neighbouring property is slim, it is still significant enough to prevent overshadowing. Coupling this distance with the size of the boundary treatments adjacent to the proposal, means that the potential for overshadowing is minimal. The angle of the roof will also further reduce the potential for overshadowing on the neighbouring property.

No north facing windows are proposed, therefore, there are no overlooking concerns.

The proposal accords to Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP in terms of residential amenity.

Highways and Parking

The proposal would increase the car parking spaces available to the occupier. Thus, further reducing any potential need for on-street parking or driveway parking. Consequently, the application would improve the parking situation on site.

Planning Balance

The proposed design would be in keeping with the character of the area and would appear well melded into the fabric of the property.

There is a limited potential for overshadowing due to the boundary treatments present and the distance between the property and its neighbour. There is no potential for overlooking.

The proposal therefore accords to Policies 2, 3 and 36 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.