DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H18-0134-21**	**Applicant:**	**Mr Cook & Miss Cooper**
Proposal:	Proposed rear extension		
Location:	220 Bridge Road Sutton Bridge Spalding		
Terminal Date:	9th April 2021		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

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 planning application that seeks permission for proposed rear extension to the dwellinghouse at 220 Bridge Road, Sutton Bridge, Spalding

Site Description

The site is within the built-up area of Sutton Bridge. Bridge Road is the historic main road of the village. As such, there is a wide range of plot sizes, land uses, designs, ages and appearances

across the street scene.

The application site is sizable. A long spacious drive area is to the front of the property. The main building is a two-storey detached family house. The rear garden is of considerable size, all laid in lawn. A nearly 2 metre closeboard fence enclose the domestic area.

The adjoining properties are bungalows. To the rear of the eastern property (No. 216), there is a two-storey detached house (No. 214) which is observed from the garden of the application site.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Sutton Bridge Parish Council

No objection.
"In keeping with the residential nature of the area"

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

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

Design and layout

Paragraph 127 of 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. Policies 2 and 3 of SELLP 2019 amongst other matters seek to ensure that development respects the character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development and land uses.

The proposed extension would be two-storey and protrude from the rear of the dwellinghouse. It would project outward 5 metres. The width would be 6.15 metres. The apex height would be nearly as much as the ridgeline of the house. Having also regard to the scale of the house, it is considered that the development would appear subservient to the host property.

Internally, the house extension would allow the householder to gain further floorspace for a large kitchen on the ground floor, and one ensuite bedroom with dressing room on the firs floor. The aim of the proposal is to meet the living needs of the householders and, in turn, in keeping with the residential use of the property.

The material schedule is such that the appearance of the house extension would match the existing fabric of the property.

Residential amenity

Paragraph 127 of National Planning Policy Framework (2019) amongst other matters seeks places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policies 2 and 3 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) set out residential amenity and relationship to existing development and land uses as main considerations when making planning decisions.

The key consideration is the relationship of the proposed openings with the neighbouring land. Two first-floor windows would be opened on the eastern side wall of the extension. However, obscuring glazing would be installed for them and therefore no overlooking would occur onto the curtilage of No. 216. With regards to the bedroom window facing onto the garden, it would have an excessive oblique angle of vision towards the upper primary windows of No. 214 that would not lead to any overlooking. Furthermore, the separation distance among them is considerable, approximately 24

metres with the nearest opposing window.

Car parking provision

After carrying out the proposal, the property would have up to 4 bedrooms. In conjunction with Policy 36 of SELLP 2019, Appendix 6 sets out the minimum standards for parking provision upon the use class. 3 car spaces should be provided for dwellings with 4 bedrooms or more.

The plot benefits from spacious drive area with turning point. The house extension would not entail further demand on on-street parking and private vehicles could be easily parked within the plot.

Planning Balance

The principle of an extension and alterations that are incidental to the enjoyment of a dwelling is acceptable. The aim of the proposals is to meet the increasing living needs of the householders.

The scale and height of the development is subservient to the host property. The proposed materials would deliver an external appearance sympathetic with the current fabric of the building. No harm upon the amenity standards is anticipated for the residents living nearby. The additional bedroom is not anticipated to increase the pressure on the car parking demand within the curtilage.

On balance, no adverse impact of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so, when assessed against the planning policies taken as a whole.

Conclusion

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.

Taking into account the above, this application accords with Policies 1, 2, 3, 36 and Appendix 6 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) as well as Section 12 of National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Accordingly, it is recommended to approve this application via delegated powers.

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.