

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H16-0974-24 **Applicant:** M Beck
Proposal: Single storey wrap around extension and rendering of the dwelling
Location: 7 Exeter Drive Spalding
Terminal Date: 3rd February 2025

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01 Spatial Strategy
02 Development Management
03 Design of New Development
04 Approach to Flood Risk
36 Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6 Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 4 - Decision-making
Section 11 - Making effective use of land
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

National Guidance

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission for a single storey wrap around extension on the side and rear of 7 Exeter Drive, Spalding.

The proposed plans have been amended during the determination of the application in order to reduce the height of the proposed extension. This involved removing the proposed parapet walls. A larger corner window is also proposed. This window would not face directly onto neighbouring windows. Therefore, increasing the size of this window is not expected to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking. As such, it was not considered necessary to re-consult on the amended proposals.

The description of development has also been updated during the determination of the application in order to refer to the rendering of the front of the dwelling. The dwelling appears to have been rendered within the past few years, however, a planning application was not previously submitted for this alteration. Therefore, although the application did not originally seek retrospective consent for the rendering, it is considered appropriate to include this within the current application.

Site Description

The site comprises land at 7 Exeter Drive, Spalding. The site features a two-storey detached dwelling. The site is within the settlement boundary of Spalding, as identified within South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and the accompanying policies map.

Relevant History

No planning applications have previously been submitted within the site.

Consultation Responses

Responses have been received from the below referenced consultees. The responses are summarised below, however, the responses can be viewed in their entirety on South Holland District Council's website.

CLlr R A Gibson: No response received.

CLlr G P Scalese: No response received.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS Support: No objections. The proposal is for Single storey wrap around extension with flat roof and parapet walls and it does not have an impact on the Public Highway or Surface Water Flood Risk.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board: No response received.

Tree Officer: No response received.

Public Representations

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, no letters of representation have been received.

Key Planning Considerations

Development Plan

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The

relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, December 2024 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

There are no adopted Neighbourhood Plans for the area within which the site is located.

The site is located within the settlement of Spalding and the proposal seeks to extend an existing dwelling. As such, the principle of the proposed extension is acceptable. The proposed extension would not provide an additional bedroom, consequently the parking requirements for the dwelling within the site would remain unchanged. As such, the main considerations which are relevant to the proposal include whether the design and amenity impact is acceptable. Lastly, as the site is within Flood Zone 3 it is necessary to consider the flood risk impact of the proposals.

Design and Visual Impact

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF, states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area (including beyond the short term) and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan outlines sustainable development considerations for proposals; providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals. Policy 3 of the Local Plan requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

The proposed extension would be located to the rear and side of the existing dwelling. The extension measures 8.8m by 5.4m at its longest and it is proposed to wrap around the rear of the dwelling. The proposed extension would be located behind an existing flat roofed single storey side extension where an integrated garage is located. The front of the property would therefore remain largely unchanged as the extension would only be partly visible from the street scene. As set out previously, the height of the extension has been reduced to integrate the extension. The extension initially measured approximately 3.4m in height whereas the extension now measures 2.9m. The scale and siting of the extension is therefore acceptable.

The brickwork for the extension is proposed to match the existing brickwork on the dwelling. The materials are therefore acceptable.

The front of the dwelling has been rendered. This element of the application is retrospective. There are examples of rendered frontages on other dwellings within the street scene and the visual impact of the rendered frontage is acceptable.

The design and visual impact of the extension is acceptable. The proposal would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area and therefore accords with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that development should 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.

Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan set out that residential amenity and the relationship to existing development and land uses is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

The proposed extension would be located on the northern side elevation of the dwelling. The nearest dwelling is therefore 5 Exeter Drive, which is located to the north of the site. 5 Exeter Drive comprises a detached two storey dwelling. There is a boundary fence between the properties and there is approximately 1.5m between the side elevation of 7 Exeter Drive and the side boundary. The proposed extension would continue the existing building line along the side elevation and as such, the extension would be 1.5m from the boundary. The proposed extension would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing due to its positioning and scale.

No windows are proposed on the side elevation with 5 Exeter Drive. Windows are proposed on the rear and southern side elevation. The rear elevation does not face directly onto any neighbouring properties. The southern side elevation partly faces onto 9 Exeter Drive, which is located to the south. There is a boundary fence between the properties and as such there is some screening already in place to reduce the degree of overlooking between the dwellings. The window and door on the side elevation are therefore not expected to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking.

The proposed development therefore accords with the Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan.

Flood Risk

The application site is within Flood Zone 3, however, the proposal is for a side extension which would largely be located within the footprint of the existing orangery. The proposed extension would not feature ground floor sleeping accommodation. The levels would be set at the same levels as the existing dwelling.

The site is within a 'Danger to all' hazard area, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2017). However, as the proposal is for a householder development the SFRA does not set out specific mitigation measures that the development is required to accord with. The development is also not required to pass the sequential or exception tests, as set out in Paragraph 176 of the NPPF. The flood risk impact of the proposals is therefore acceptable.

Planning Balance

As detailed above, Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposed development is appropriate and would not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or the amenity of nearby residents. The development is also acceptable in terms of highway safety. Therefore, the proposed development accords with the Local Plan and the NPPF.

Conclusion

Taking these factors into consideration, the proposal accords with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 36 of the Local Plan, as well as Sections 9 and 12 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the benefits of the proposal; therefore, the planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be approved under Delegated Authority.

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.