

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H16-0704-20 **Applicant:** Mrs D Scott
Proposal: Demolish garage and erect single storey side extension
Location: 68 Crown Drive Spalding
Terminal Date: 22nd 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 that seeks permission to demolish the garage and erect a single storey side extension at 68 Crown Drive, Spalding.

Site Description

The property is a detached bungalow situated at the north-east of Spalding, in a residential area with bungalows of a similar age and design.

The bungalow is set back approximately 8m from the road, with a large gravelled and block paved driveway and 1m high white picket fence as the boundary treatment to the south-east. No's. 64 and 70 also share a similar proximity from the main road.

The property has a single detached garage situated to the south-west of the bungalow, which adjoins the site boundary.

History

No relevant planning history.

Consultation Responses

No consultation responses received.

Planning Considerations

Principle

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Spalding as set out in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. The principle of developing a house extension that is incidental to the enjoyment of a dwelling house is acceptable.

Layout and Design

Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting; and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, among other considerations. 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 single storey side extension will protrude from the south western elevation of the property. It will project approx. 2.6m towards the southern boundary of the site adjoining to no.70 Crown Drive. The depth of this extension will be just over half the depth of the existing side wall at approx. 5.8m. The maximum height of the gable roof will be approx. 4.8m and will be subservient to the existing gable roof height. The eaves will match the existing. Having regard to the existing dimensions of the house, the proposed addition is acceptable in terms of scale.

The proposed extension will accommodate a utility room/lobby and an additional shower room. It will be accessed off the existing dining area. The utility/lobby room will have two external doors (south-western and north-western elevations). There will be cupboard space to store the existing metre box. This is in keeping with the residential use of the property.

The demolition of the existing garage will remove a potential car parking space. However, the driveway is a sufficient size for at least two car spaces for the bungalow, which is in accordance with Appendix 6 of the SELLP. The garage will free up the space, removing the existing closed off patio to the south west elevation. Instead, the proposed extension will provide a linear access into the rear garden with approx. 1.1m gap between the boundary with no.70.

The proposed roof will be a gable end pitched roof, which will match with the existing gable roof type of the bungalow. The proposed materials include the facing brick and roof tiles to match the existing as closely as possible, as well as the windows and doors that are proposed for a white Upvc which will match the existing.

Taking the above into account, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP, 2019) and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in terms of layout, design, size and scale.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

The proposed extension will not have a material adverse impact upon residential amenity in terms of overlooking, overshadowing or being overbearing.

It will have a window on the south-eastern elevation, bringing natural light into the additional shower room. The property directly opposite at no.47 Crown Drive has a separation distance of approx. 32m from the proposed extension, which will not impact upon overlooking should the windows be for a habitable space and the bathroom window would be obscured glazed.

The property at no.70 to the south-west, will not be impacted by the extension due to the single storey nature. Furthermore, the extension will have a lower ridge height than the existing bungalow and there is boundary fencing in between both properties.

Taking the above into account, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (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.