DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H18-0523-21**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs C Jude**
Proposal:	Extension to Kitchen		
Location:	Greenbank 13 Falklands Road Sutton Bridge		
Terminal Date:	5th July 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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a householder application seeking permission for a single storey side extension measuring 4.5 metres (width) x 5.4 metres (depth). It would have a flat roof standing at 2.8 metres in height (3.8 metres including the roof lantern). It would extend the existing kitchen. The external material would match the existing dwelling.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The property is a detached bungalow located on Falklands Road in Sutton Bridge. The property is

yellow brick built with white door/window frames. The front garden is hard surfaced and has parking provisions for at least 4no cars. The immediate area comprises primarily residential dwellings with some open space immediate to the west of the site. A tree line and fencing form the western boundary.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

REPRESENTATIONS

Sutton Bridge Parish Council

No objections as the scheme is in keeping with the street scene.

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 flat roof is not considered to be ideal, however given its considerable set-back from the front boundary and the fact part of the extension would sit behind the existing side projecting porch, the proposed extension would not appear overly prominent in the street scene. Overall the extension is considered to be proportionate in size to the existing dwelling. The relatively modest side projection and limited height would ensure it does not appear overly prominent in relation to the existing dwelling. Furthermore the use of matching external materials would ensure the extension is not at odds with the character of the existing dwelling.

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

Impacts upon Residential Amenity

The extension would not be visible to the neighbours to the east as it would not extend beyond the front/rear elevations of the existing dwelling nor would it be any higher. As such it would be entirely blocked by the applicants existing house.

There are no immediate neighbours to the west of the application site where the proposed extension would be sited.

As such no unacceptable impact would result on neighbouring amenity and 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. It is unclear how many bedrooms the property has, however a maximum of 3no parking spaces would be required for the property which can be accommodated in the driveway to the front. As such the scheme complies with the parking standards.

Planning Balance

Given its set-back from the front boundary, 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 and 3 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.