DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H16-0361-23**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs M Sampson**
Proposal:	Extension and alterations - resubmission of H16-0418-22		
Location:	41 Grange Drive Spalding		
Terminal Date:	12th June 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	0	0	0	2

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder application for a series of proposed extensions and alteration to 41 Grange Drive. This is a resubmission of H16-0418-22, with several key differences, most notably, the removal of the proposed second storey extension.

Proposed here are two rear extensions. The first measures approximately 1921mm (width) by 3445 mm (depth) would be located to the south of the site. This space is to be used as an ensuite and cupboard. The second is to the north-west and would measure 4665mm (width) by 4660mm (depth). The space would be used as a kitchen. Internally, several minor alterations are proposed,

however, these are not related to the application.

The previously approved scheme was for a second-storey extension, incorporating two additional bedrooms. Instead of the rear extension, a pergoda was proposed under the previously approved scheme. The southern extension remains in this new application, although its use has changed.

Site Description

The dwelling is situated within the defined settlement of Spalding, as outlined within the South-East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP). It is a detached, brown brick bungalow located within the residential estate of Grange Drive, which consists of a variety of single storey and two storey dwellings of a variety of designs.

Relevant History

H16-0418-22 - Full. Extensions and alterations. Approved 14/06/22.

Consultation Responses

Resident Comments

Two comments received, summarised below:

-Lean to shed on neighbouring property would have to be removed due to works (not a material planning concern)
-Request for clarification that the outbuilding accords to regulation (not a material concern, however, a response was sent by the case officer to assure the consultee the building to conform to regulation)

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 materials and finishes are to match the existing property, making the proposal seem well blended into the fabric of the dwelling. Although there is a variety of designs in the area, the removal of the second storey extension that was approved under H16-0418-22 will further solidify that the design is in keeping with the character of the area.

The vast majority of the works will be obscured from the street, ensuring that the visual impact upon the street scene is minimal.

The scale of the works is proportionate to the host dwelling. The height of the roof will be consistent with the host, further reducing the potential visual impact. The roof design will be blended into the host, reducing the visual impact of the proposal.

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.

Due to the single storey nature of the proposal, and the sizeable boundary treatments present, the potential for overlooking is minimal. The proposed skylight will face the dwelling to the north; however, it will not face any windows, preventing overlooking.

The potential for overshadowing is minimal, due to the sizeable boundary treatments and the single storey nature of the development. The reduction in height between this new proposal and the previously approved scheme further reduces the potential for overshadowing.

Highways and Parking

The previously approved scheme included two additional bedrooms, meaning an additional parking space was required. As both of these bedrooms have been removed on this revised scheme, no additional parking is required.

The proposal therefore conforms to Policy 36 and Appendix 6 of the SELLP in terms of parking and highway safety.

Planning Balance

The proposal conforms to Policy 2 of the SELLP in terms of design and scale. The proposed materials would match the host dwelling, ensuring a visual continuity. The proposed height is in keeping with the host and the proposed scale is proportionate to the original dwelling.

The proposal raises no overlooking or overshadowing concerns. The boundary treatments and the positioning of skylights ensures that the proposed extension would not look onto neighbouring properties. The height of the development, coupled with the aforementioned border treatments would prevent any additional overshadowing.

Due to the reduction in scale of the proposal and the loss of the two additional bedrooms compared to the previously approved H16-0418-22, no additional parking would be required.

The comment regarding the adjoining lean to shed has been noted, however, it is not a material planning concern. In addition, the previously approved plans would also have seen the relevant wall demolished.

The proposal conforms to all relevant policies and as such the planning balance is n favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

The recommendation therefore 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.