

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER**DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER**

Application No: H17-0790-19 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Whyles

Proposal: Alterations and extension to dwelling

Location: 53 Seas End Road Surfleet Spalding

Terminal Date: 10th October 2019

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
PARISH COUNCIL	0	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT**Proposal**

This is a householder application for alterations and an extension to the existing dwelling at 53 Seas End Road, Surfleet.

Site Description

The site accommodates a chalet type dwelling within a fairly large plot. It is set back approximately 14m from the road and therefore has a large front garden. The property is situated on higher ground level, compared to the existing properties that are situated on the other side of the road, they appear to be at a much lower ground level. The boundary treatment of the property is mainly mature shrubbery and trees. There are a variety of single storey and two storey dwellings in the area of

different design and age.

History

No relevant history.

Consultation Responses

Surfleet Parish Council in support of this application.

Planning Considerations

Size and Scale

The proposal includes the removal of the side garage, to accommodate a new side extension for the newly laid out kitchen and utility space. This would project from the north-eastern elevation by approximately 2.9m. The extension would extend past the existing rear elevation of the dwelling by approximately 4.2m with a total width of approximately 6m. The proposed development will overall create a larger kitchen space for the property, including a space for a utility room as well as a small downstairs bathroom. The ridge height of the proposed extension would be below that of the existing dwelling. Given the size and scale of the proposed extension and the size of the plot the proposal is considered acceptable.

Layout and Design

The proposed development includes several alterations to the property. The development proposes the increase in size of the kitchen space and an addition of a small utility room. It also includes the addition of a new dormer on the rear elevation but this would merely appear as an extension to the existing rear dormer. The materials of the newly built sections will have facing brick to matching the existing material, the new roof will be of the same concrete interlocking tile to match the existing and is therefore acceptable. Given that existing development in the area is varied in terms of design, the proposed design is considered suitable.

Impact upon residential amenity

The proposed development would not materially affect residential amenity. The residents will still have their existing patio space, and they have a large rear garden which will not be affected by the build. There is a new roof light which will be fitted to the front facing roof slope to create natural light to the new downstairs WC and a new window on the front elevation to a new wash area, however these would be some distance (approx. 27m) from the property opposite. The new window at first floor for the bathroom would be obscure glazed. There will be a new creation of a dormer to the rear of the property and roof light which will over look to the south east, where there are no properties - There is a river and a golf club in the distance. Therefore it would be acceptable, as it will not impact upon residential amenity.

Conclusion

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

The recommendation is therefore 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.