

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H18-0046-20 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs D Howe

Proposal: Proposed internal alterations and extension to the rear to form kitchen, dining and living area.

Location: 46 New Road Sutton Bridge Spalding

Terminal Date: 19th March 2020

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

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 12. Achieving well-designed places

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
RESIDENTS	0	1	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application that seeks permission for proposed internal alterations and extension to the rear to form kitchen, dining and living area at 46 New Road, Sutton Bridge, Spalding.

Site Description

The site is part of frontage development on the eastern side of New Road. As residential properties were individually designed, there is a varied mixture of house types, designs, appearances and ages in the locality.

The application site is long linear. The property is a two-storey Victorian house. To the north-east, there is a large two-storey detached house (No. 48) within a more spacious plot. To the south-west, a pair of semi-detached dwellings and a private driveway in between serving access to No. 44 which is beyond the rear boundary of the site.

Most of the boundary treatment consists of nearly 2 metre high timber closeboard fence. The rear garden is laid in lawn. One large outbuilding used as a garage is adjacent to the southern boundary.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Sutton Bridge Parish Council

No objection.

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Sutton Bridge as set out in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. There is no objection to the principle of extension and associated alterations to a residential property. By reason of nature, the development cannot be located elsewhere more sustainable following the settlement hierarchy in Policy 1 of SELLP. The key policy issues of this proposal therefore relate to the material considerations mentioned below.

Design and layout

Paragraph 127 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, among other considerations. 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 as per Policy 2 of the SELLP.

The proposed extension would protrude 5.80 metres from the original rear wall of the house and would fill nearly the entire width of this wall. The maximum height would be 3.24 metres. Having regard to the dimensions of the house, it is considered that the development would be subservient to the host property in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

The existing lean-to roof element on the northern side elevation exceeding the rear wall of the house would be demolished to erect the proposed development. Internally, alteration comprising wall demolition, wall erection and brick-up internal openings would be carried out to vary the distribution. The existing pantry would merge with the kitchen to create a hall and shower room. The new extension would accommodate a large combined kitchen/dining/living room.

Externally, the prevailing features of the development would be the layout of the openings and the roof treatment. The rear elevation would have 3 no. large sliding glass doors serving access to a patio area bordered with raised garden beds. 2 no. slit windows would be opened on the southern side elevation. There would be also 3 no. roof lights near the original wall of the house. All fenestration would be made of dark grey aluminium. The outer part of the flat roof would be laid in sedum forming a green roof. TIER Multipack Stone Cladding in Multicolour would be applied on the external walls of the extension.

With regards to flood risk, the provision of a green roof is well-regarded as it incorporates the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to the design of new development. It is in accordance with

criterion (f) of Policy 4 SELLP which states that the proposal should not increase risk elsewhere and that opportunities through layout, form of development and green infrastructure have been considered as a way of providing flood betterment and reducing flood risk overall.

In light of these features, the development would be of high quality design. The resulting appearance would be of contemporary design without being at odds with the traditional character of the Victorian house. The flat roof would be characteristic of rear house extensions. The stone colour cladding would be sympathetic with the multi-brick ochre facing brickwork of the house. Therefore, the development would be acceptable in line with the aforementioned policies.

Residential amenity

There is no residential building immediately adjacent to the proposed extension and patio. There is a large gable pitched outbuilding adjoining the northern boundary with No. 48. Neither the site inspection outcome nor the planning history indicate that this unit has use as an individual residential unit. A large timber garage adjoins the south-western boundary which would obscure views of the extension from the property to the south-west, and beyond the south-western boundary fence there is also a driveway serving access to No. 44 to the south-east which increases the separation distance.

For these reasons, it is concluded that the development complies with residential amenity which is one of the key principles of design and development management as set out in Policies 2 and 3 of SELLP (2019).

Conclusion

Taking into account the considerations above, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019 as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019.

It is accordingly recommended to approve this application via delegated decision.

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.