DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H16-0672-20**	**Applicant:**	**Mr J Doades & Miss K Arnott**
Proposal:	Single storey extension forward of front elevation		
Location:	25 Campbells Close Spalding		
Terminal Date:	13th October 2020		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

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 application for a proposed single storey extension forward of the front elevation at 25 Campbells Close, Spalding.

Site Description

The property is a detached 2 bed bungalow situated within the loop of Campbells Close, in a predominantly residential part of south Spalding. The area is characterised by single and two storey dwellings which are of a similar age and design to the bungalow at 25 Campbells Close.

The dwelling has a large grassed front garden with mature hedging as the boundary treatment. There is also a long driveway to the side of the dwelling, which could accommodate at least 3 car spaces.

History

No relevant planning history.

Consultation Responses

No responses.

Planning Considerations

Layout and Design

The proposed extension will project forward of the existing attached garage by approx. 1.3m and would be as wide as the existing garage. The proposal will involve the loss of the garage, and instead the creation of a utility room off the existing kitchen, with an additional shower room to the rear. It is set back considerably from the rest of the property meaning the visual impact would be minimal.

The proposal is for a flat roof design, which will be a continuation of the existing flat roof. The existing garage door will be replaced with a window. The materials for the proposed extension are proposed to match the existing. Overall, the design is in keeping with the existing property and would not materially impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

Therefore, taking the above into account, the proposed layout and design of the single storey extension complies with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 and is therefore deemed as acceptable.

Size and Scale

The proposed extension will be small in scale - projecting forward of the existing attached garage by approx. 1.3m and would be as wide as the existing garage. The roof height would be the same as the existing garage. It will therefore be subservient to the host property.

Given the above, the proposed extension is considered to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in this regard. Therefore the proposed extension is deemed as acceptable.

Impacts upon Residential Amenity

It is not considered that the proposed extensions and alterations to the dwelling will have a material adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of overlooking, loss of light or being overbearing.

The extension is small in scale and with a 5.2m (approx.) separation distance to the boundary with the neighbouring property. The only additional window would be forward facing and the door to the new utility room would open out towards the boundary fence, the other side of which is a bungalow. Overlooking is therefore not an issue.

Therefore the proposed extension is considered to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in terms of residential amenity.

Conclusion

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

The recommendation is therefore for a 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.