DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H16-0302-19**	**Applicant:**	**Mr S Twell**
Proposal:	Front Extension		
Location:	9 Low Road Spalding		
Terminal Date:	13th May 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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application for a front extension at 9 Low Road, Spalding.

Site Description

The site context is predominantly characterised by residential development. The application's property is a bungalow of traditional 'brick-and-tile' appearance flanked by two-storey detached properties. A variety of type, designs, appearances and ages has been observed in the locality. The house is greatly set back from the highway providing a paved front driveway with turning point.

History

None

Consultation Responses

None

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 proposed extension would project 3.13 metres from the front elevation and 1.14 metres from the western side elevation. The width would be 4.94 metres. The maximum apex height would measure approximately 4.90 metres and the eaves 2.60 metres. Having regard to the dimensions of the bungalow, the intended development would be subservient to the host property in terms of scale, massing and bulking.

Design and layout

The purpose of the extension is to create one additional bedroom up to a total number of two bedrooms in the bungalow. This is acceptable in view of the living needs of the current occupiers. The external layout of the extension would be tantamount to the existing front gable roofed element. The bulk would keep just behind the building line across the residential frontage along the street. The extension ridgeline would be lower than that of the main bungalow roof. There would be 1.58 metres to the western side boundary and 8 to the road. For these reasons, the form of development would be consistent with the remainder of the bungalow and would not have a detrimental effect on the character of the street given its location to the front.

The proposed materials are stated to match those existing in the dwelling, thus the visual amenity and appearance would not result significantly altered.

Impact upon residential amenity

A 2 metre high timber close board fence would be on the eastern side elevation whereas mature hedgerow of similar height would be on the eastern side elevation. Such boundary treatment would mitigate the visual impact of the extension to adjacent properties No. 7a and No.1 Low Fields Avenue. The low brick wall and picket fence on the front boundary would not conceal the site although the extension would not be disruptive on any view from the road in view of above-mentioned separation distances.

The proposed extension is set greatly forward in relation to the existing front gabled element of the bungalow. However, the bulk of the development would not create any overshadowing to the front windows of the lounge.

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.

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 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.