DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H18-0450-21**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs A Bennett**
Proposal:	Extension & Alterations		
Location:	37 Wrights Lane Sutton Bridge Spalding		
Terminal Date:	21st June 2021		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

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
RESIDENTS	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a householder application seeking permission for a ground floor rear extension to create a utility room and a first floor side extension to create 2no bedrooms. The extensions would have a width of 2.9 metres and extend the depth of the property. The external materials would match the existing dwelling.

It should be noted that the plans have been amended and the roof ridge of the proposed extension reduced in height.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The property is a detached two storey dwelling on located on Wrights Lane in Sutton Bridge. The dwelling is buff brick built with white door/window frames. There is a flat room porch element and garage to the front/side. The site benefits from a gravelled driveway with parking provision for 3no vehicles. The immediate area is characterised by detached residential dwellings with off-street parking provision. The western boundary abuts the open countryside.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

REPRESENTATIONS

Sutton Bridge Parish Council
Support the scheme as it is in keeping with the street scene.

Public

A third party has recommended the installation of a minimum of 3no swift nest bricks be required by a planning condition to provide enhancement for biodiversity.

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 extension initially proposed was considered to be very dominant because of its roof ridge height. As such the scheme has been amended and the roof height lowered to make it appear more subservient. The revised scheme is considered to be sympathetic in design and proportionate to the existing dwelling. The modest side projection and roof ridge sitting lower than the existing house would ensure the extensions do not dominate the existing dwelling. Furthermore the use of matching external materials would further ensure the extensions are in keeping with the existing dwelling. In addition, there are examples of similar extensions on the street therefore the proposed development would not be out of keeping with the street scene.

As such the extensions would comply with the aforementioned policies on design, layout and impact upon the character of the local area.

Impacts upon Residential Amenity

The closest neighbour to the proposed development is to the south at no.35 Wrights Lane. The proposed development would bring the application site closer to this neighbour at first floor level, however, given the fact this neighbour does not have any windows in its side elevation facing the application site it is not considered to result in any overbearing impact or unacceptable overshadowing. No first floor windows are proposed in the side elevation facing this neighbour therefore there are no overlooking or loss of privacy concerns.

With regards to the neighbour to the north at no.39 Wrights Lane the proposed extensions would not be visible to this neighbour as they would not extend beyond the existing front and rear elevations therefore they would be blocked by the applicants existing house.

As such the proposal would accord with Paragraph 127 of National Planning Policy Framework

(2019) and Policies 2 and 3 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019).

Parking

In connection with Policy 36 of SELLP 2019, Appendix 6 sets out the minimum requirements for car parking provision. The proposed scheme would increase the number of bedrooms in the property from 3 to 4, increasing the parking requirement for the site from 2no spaces to 3no. The existing driveway has space for 3no spaces. As such the scheme is considered to comply with the current parking standards.

Other matters

One letter of representation has been received from a local resident recommending installation of a minimum of 3no swift nest bricks be required by a planning condition to provide enhancement for biodiversity. The comments are noted, and a condition recommended to this effect.

Planning Balance

The proposal will not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality or amenity of nearby residents. The planning balance is therefore considered to be in favour of the proposal.

CONCLUSION

In light of the considerations above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2, 3 and 36 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (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.

RECOMMENDATION

The application can be approved under delegated powers.