

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H18-0622-21 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs P Thompson
Proposal: Proposed extensions & alterations & boundary wall
Location: 26 Wrights Lane Sutton Bridge Spalding
Terminal Date: 10th August 2021

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02 Development Management
03 Design of New Development
28 The Natural Environment
36 Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6 Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

NPPF 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
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a householder application seeking permission for a front porch, ground floor rear extension, first floor side extension, 1no rooflight on rear & a front boundary wall with 6no pillars and gates.

The front porch would measure 2.2 metres (depth) x 2.4 metres (width) and stand at 4.3 metres in height (2.6 metres to the eaves). The ground floor rear extension would measure 5.7 (depth) metres x 4.3 metres (width) and stand at 4.1 metres in height (2.6 metres to the eaves). The first floor side extension would sit on top of the existing garage. The boundary wall would stand at 0.8 metres in height and the pillars would stand at 1.2 metres in height. Timber effect boarding is proposed on the side gable and all other external materials would match the existing dwelling.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The property is a detached bungalow located on Wrights Lane in Sutton Bridge. The dwelling is red brick built with white door/window frames. It has a gable end and a dormer in the roof fronting the street. The site benefits from an attached single flat roofed garage and a gravelled driveway with parking provision for 3no vehicles. The immediate area is characterised by detached residential dwellings with off-street parking provision.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

REPRESENTATIONS

Sutton Bridge Parish Council

Support the scheme as it is in keeping with the street scene.

Local Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority

Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.

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; 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 extensions are considered to be sympathetic and proportionate to the existing bungalow. The external materials are also considered sympathetic and in keeping with the existing dwelling. The pitched roof element on the front porch is not considered to be ideal, however, given its set back from the front boundary and the fact its height would be lower than the existing front gable, it would not appear overly prominent. As such it can on balance be accepted.

There are a variety of boundary treatments in the street, including walls. Given this and the low height of the proposed wall/gates/pillars it is not considered to appear overly prominent or result in incongruous impact on the street scene.

The proposed rooflight would not be visible from the street scene given its location to the rear of the property and it is not considered to unacceptably change the overall appearance of the dwelling therefore it can be accepted. In addition, this could be installed under permitted development.

As such the proposed development 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 proposed wall/gates/pillars would be located adjacent to the highway therefore no neighbours would be unacceptably impacted by them.

The proposed rooflight would not directly overlook any neighbours and given the fact there are already primary windows on the rear elevation it is not considered to result in any additional impact.

The closest neighbour to the proposed development is to the west at no.24 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 primary 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. The proposed front porch and rear extension would be located a significant distance from the shared boundary with this neighbour therefore no unacceptable overshadowing or overbearing impact would result.

With regards to the neighbour to the east at no.28 Wrights Lane the proposed porch and side extension would not be visible to this neighbour as these would not extend beyond the existing front/rear elevations of the existing bungalow. As such no unacceptable impact would result from these. The proposed rear extension would be located approximately 1.4 metres from the shared boundary with this neighbour and 2.8 metres from this neighbour's closest elevation. Given this neighbour is set back from the application site the proposed extension would not extend beyond the rear elevation of this neighbour. As such it would not result in overbearing impact or unacceptable overshadowing.

With regards to the neighbour to the rear the proposed extension would be located a significant distance from the rear boundary (approximately 29 metres). Given this separation distance no unacceptable impact would result on this neighbour.

As such the proposal would accord with Paragraph 130 of National Planning Policy Framework (2021) 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 not increase the number of bedrooms in the property therefore the parking requirement would not change the existing parking spaces on the site would be retained. As such the scheme is considered to comply with the current parking standards.

Planning Balance

The proposal will not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, the amenity of nearby residents or unacceptably impact highway safety. 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 (2021).

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.