DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H18-0513-23**	**Applicant:**	**Mrs Belham**
Proposal:	Removal of existing conservatory & replace with single storey flat & pitched roof extension		
Location:	Silverleas 47 Wrights Lane Sutton Bridge		
Terminal Date:	29th August 2023		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

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 the removal of existing conservatory and replace with single storey flat and pitched roof extension at Silverleas, 47 Wrights Lane. The proposal will be the same length as the existing dwelling and around the same height protruding from the rear by approximately 4m.

Site Description

The site lies within the settlement boundary of Sutton Bridge as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP). The property is a detached bungalow with a driveway situated directly in front with a gravel area either side. The dwelling is made from bricks with a tiled

roof ad brown uPVC doors and frames with a red garage door. Attached to the rear elevation is a conservatory which will be demolished as part of the application to make way for the extension, there is also a small garden shed on the norther boundary fence. There is a row of large trees at the rear of their boundary which backs onto fields and some small allotments further north.

History

No relevant planning history.

Consultation Responses

Sutton Bridge Parish Council

Support - Application in keeping with the street scene.

Planning Considerations

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2021 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, that they are visually attractive, as a result of good architecture, and are sympathetic to local character. 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 materials being used om the development will be in keeping with the dwelling it is apart of to ensure it blends in. The walls will be made of red/brown brickwork with composite cladding, the roof will be tiled and the windows, doors and fascia's/soffits will be uPVC in the same brown as existing. All the materials match the existing house and therefore ensures that the proposal will be in keeping with the area and is acceptable.

The proposed rear extension will be slightly smaller than the existing dwelling, the soffits will be 12.4ft with the ridges being 13.5ft. It will protrude from the rear elevation by approximately 4m and run the same length as the dwelling only slightly smaller on the edges (approx. 14m). In replacement of the conservatory the extension at the rear will feature a flat roof in the centre between the two side gable roofs, whilst flat roofed extension would not be supported, in this instance the positioning of the extension at the rear means it will be mostly hidden by the host dwelling and not visible from the highway. The proposed design is acceptable and will not impact the overall character of the surrounding area. The measurements are considered to be proportionate to the dwelling in terms of scale, size and bulk.

As part of the development there will be some alterations taking place. The bedroom at the rear, labelled on the plans as 'Bedroom 3', will be extended and opened up into the extension to create a large amount of extra floor space and make it the biggest bedroom in the house. Similarly, the utility on the opposite side will also be extended into the extension and be made bigger. The conservatory will be removed and such replaced with the extension, in this section the kitchen will be opened up into the dining area to make an open plan kitchen/diner with a small seating area to make somewhat of a second lounge. Some windows at the rear will also be changed throughout, the utility and bedroom windows will be slightly altered and the design of them will change with a set of French Doors going in the dining area to allow easy access to the rear garden.

Impact upon Resident Amenity

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF amongst other matters, seeks places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP set out residential amenity and relationship to existing development and land uses as main considerations when making planning decisions.

No overlooking concerns will arise as a result of the proposed extension as there are only new windows facing the rear and as due to the single storey nature of the proposal all the windows will be on ground floor level. No privacy will be lost following the application being approved. Despite there being a distance of 0.9m on the south and 1.4m on the north, the positioning of the extension means that no shadow will be cast onto the northern and southern neighbours. Naturally, after the

initial construction, which itself would take place over a short period, minimal additional noise pollution would be causes as a result of the development.

The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policies 2 & 3 of the SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Planning Balance

It is considered that removal of existing conservatory and replace with single storey flat roof and pitched roof extension can be incorporated onto the site without materially harming the character and amenity of the locality. There will be no overlooking and no overshadowing as a result of the development taking place. The application is therefore in accordance with Policies 2, 3 of the SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Conclusion

The recommendation is for 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.