

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H17-1080-20 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs K Curson

Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension with external material and internal alterations

Location: The Triangle 85a Seas End Road Surfleet

Terminal Date: 25th January 2021

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 seeking permission for a proposed single storey rear extension with external material and internal alterations at 85a Seas End Road, Surfleet.

Site Description

The property is a detached bungalow situated to the east of Seas End Road and is set well back from the road. The dwelling is situated on a fairly spacious plot, with dwellings in the surrounding area that are mostly detached and are situated on similar spacious plots. To the front boundary there is mature hedging and a gate entrance as the boundary treatment. There is a large gravelled driveway, with a detached double garage to the north. There is open access to the rear of the

property from the northern and southern sides of the dwelling. To the east of the site is the River Glen. Across the river is the Spalding Golf Club.

History

No planning history relevant.

Consultation Responses

Surfleet Parish Council- In support.

Planning Considerations

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

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 extension is to protrude from the rear elevation by approx. 5m with a width of approx. 11m. Having regard to the existing dimensions of the house, the proposed addition is acceptable in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

The monopitched roof design is a contrast to the existing gable roof design of the bungalow. However, it will not adversely impact the character of the surrounding area as it will not be visible from the front of the dwelling. The proposed monopitched roof will give a maximum height to the overall extension of approx. 4.7m and a minimum height of approx. 2.5m. The maximum height of the wall to the proposed rear elevation of the extension will allow for a large window to be situated in view of the golf course and the natural surroundings from the rear garden.

White rendering, Siberian Larch Cladding (vertical) and white masonry paint will be applied to the entirety of the external walls. Anthracite Grey PVCu windows, doors, bi-fold doors and rainwater goods are proposed for the entire dwelling. The gutters are proposed to discharge into the existing surface water drainage system, and is considered acceptable. The proposed design will be a stark contrast to what is existing, however it will provide a more modern and contemporary look to the dwelling. It is considered to not impact upon the overall character of the area, as dwellings in the surrounding area vary in character and design.

Internally, the purpose of the development is to gain further internal floor space for enlarging and creating new rooms inside the house. This includes creating an opening from the existing kitchen and the creation of a new space for a proposed family room. Overall, the proposals will ensure good living conditions of the house occupiers and in keeping with the residential use of the property.

Taking the above into account, the proposed extensions are deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in terms of layout, design, size and scale.

Impacts upon Residential Amenity

The proposed bi-folds and windows to the rear and southern side elevations of the proposed extension will not overlook unacceptably to any residential plot, neither habitable rooms of other dwellinghouses as the fenestration will face towards the rear garden, river and golf course and be angle away from neighbouring properties.

It is also not considered to have an adverse impact in terms of overshadowing or being overbearing due to the single storey nature of the development and separation distances to the boundary (3.1m and 10m respectively).

Taking the above into account, the proposal is deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in terms of residential amenity.

Planning Balance

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, states that the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposed single storey rear extension does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality or amenity of nearby residents. It is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.

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.

Conclusion

The recommendation is therefore for a delegated approval.