

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H18-0552-23 **Applicant:** Mrs H Rawlinson
Proposal: Proposed Single Storey Side Extension
Location: 124 Railway Lane South Sutton Bridge Spalding
Terminal Date: 10th August 2023

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

- 01 Spatial Strategy
- 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	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder application seeking permission for a single storey side extension at 124 Railway Lane South. The development will be 10.7m in length with the east width being 4.1m and the width on the west side of the extension will be 4.4m. The overall height will be similar to the existing dwelling.

Site Description

The site is outside of any settlement boundary and is therefore considered to be in the countryside as outlined in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP). The dwelling is a semi-detached bungalow adjoining on the southern elevation with 126 Railway Lane South. It is made of red bricks with a tiled roof and white uPVC doors and windows. This is a common design for house along this road. There is a gravel driveway at the front with a small garage situated in this area.

History

H18-0883-80 - Residential development with access at former prefab site - Approved

H18-0103-83 - Residential development, 8 plots - Approved

H18-1121-85 - Use of land for parking of one 10 tonne lorry - Refused

H18-0396-98 - New extension and alteration - Approved

Consultation Responses

Lincolnshire County Council Highways

No objection.

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 measurements of the development will be 4.1m wide at the front and 4.4m wide at the rear and approximately 10.7m in length. It is set back 0.9m from the front and protrudes 1.8m from the rear. The overall height of the extension is slightly smaller than the existing house is and comes up just shy of the existing eaves. When compared to the existing dwelling these measurements are considered to be acceptable and proportionate.

The materials being used are all in keeping with the existing dwelling itself. The walls will be made of facing brickwork, the roof will be made of concrete tiles and the windows and doors will be made of white uPVC. This ensures that the development blends in to the dwelling and it therefore won't create any visual discrepancies.

Some internal alterations will be taking place as a result of the development, this includes the new extended area to be used as a new living area which will be open planned and share the area with the existing lounge to allow for more floor space for the residents. Alongside the new living area, the extension will create a new bathroom and utility area that can be accessed via the kitchen at the front of the property. At the rear there will be the addition of a set of bi-fold doors to allow access into the rear garden, there will also be a new window on the northern elevation to allow natural light into the living area. It appears there will also be a window in the bathroom however this will be obscure glazed due to the nature of the room. A door to allow access outside onto the front drive area will be located in the utility also.

In conclusion the design of the extension is in keeping with the area, therefore this is considered to be appropriate in accordance to Policies 2 & 3 of the SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impacts 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.

On the front elevation there will be the addition of an external door to allow access outside, this door will be facing towards a property across the road the same way in which the other windows on the front elevation do, this ensures that no overlooking will arise as a result of this. At the rear of the development there will be a set of bi-fold doors, there is no neighbours behind No. 124 and this area consists of fields, this means these new windows will not overlook in any way. Finally, along the side elevation there will be two windows slightly spaced apart, following a site visit it was determined that there was a high hedge on this side of the property and due to the single storey nature of the extension there will be very minimal concerns about overlooking.

Similarly, any chances of overshadowing caused by this proposal are very minimal due to it being single storey, and there being adequate distances between neighbours and the location of the high hedge situated on the north. The overall height of the extension is slightly smaller than the existing dwelling, which is smaller than the hedge. Despite there only being a distance of 2.2m between the extension and the northern boundary, the height of the proposal and the hedge will minimise any possibility of overshadowing.

UJPlanning Balance

The proposed single storey side extension will not materially harm the character or appearance of the area. There will be no material adverse impact upon residential amenity that will arise from overshadowing or overlooking. The design, layout, size and scale will be in keeping with the local area.

It is therefore in accordance with Policies 2 & 3 of the SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF, the planning balance is therefore in favour of the proposal.

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.