

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H18-0826-20 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs K Wiles
Proposal: Extension & Alterations
Location: 258 Bridge Road Sutton Bridge Spalding
Terminal Date: 1st December 2020

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 2019

Paragraph 127 of 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 planning application that seeks permission for extension and alterations to the property at 258 Bridge Road, Sutton Bridge, Spalding.

The proposed extension is a brick wall link between the dwellinghouse and existing timber cladded outbuilding to the west.

This detached building was subject to two appeals which were dismissed. In both refused applications, the garage had same external appearance and position within the plot. The grounds of dismissal were prominence of the outbuilding by reason of scale and position and harm upon character of the local area by reason of external materials.

Site Description

The site forms part of the linear development onto Bridge Road. It is a corner plot adjoining the junction between Bridge Road (south) and Granville Terrace (west). The property is a detached two-storey dwellinghouse of large scale. A garden extends to the front of the house. There is a footpath that runs in parallel with the front boundary on Bridge Road and a verge on the western boundary onto Granville Road. The vehicular access is on this road.

A low brick wall with pillar and a gate is on the front boundary. An approximately 3 metre high mature hedge is on the western boundary. A 2 metre high timber closeboard fence enclose the yard on the corner of the site.

History

H18-0425-92 - Extension to house - Approved

H18-0442-11 -Proposed extension to form additional garage (retrospective) - Approved

H18-0462-14 - Erection of garage (retrospective) - Refused & Appeal Dismissed

H18-0530-15 - Erection of garage/shed (retrospective) re-submission of H18-0462-14 - Refused & Appeal Dismissed

Consultation Responses

Sutton Bridge Parish Council

Supports this application. Their comments state the proposal is "in keeping with the street scene".

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site lies within the settlement boundaries for Sutton Bridge as per South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. Irrespective of spatial strategy considerations, the principle of developing a house extension and alterations that are incidental to the enjoyment of a dwelling house is acceptable.

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, states that the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The key material considerations are addressed below.

Design and layout

Paragraph 127 of 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 SELLP 2019 states that proposals will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation size, scale, layout, density and impact on the amenity, trees, character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development and land uses. In this regard, Policy 3 of the SELLP sets out 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 development proposals entail significant alterations to the current timber outbuilding. The shed roof will be replaced for a gable pitched roof. Both gables ends will face north and south, respectively. The apex height of the building will increase approximately from 3.40 metres to 4.25 metres by the proposed works.

The ridge height of the extension between the dwelling house and the outbuilding will be visibly shorter than those of both buildings. Whilst the house enlargement will represent an additional material increase on the site, it will also contribute to integrate the outbuilding to the fabric of the house. The detached structure will be no longer standalone and this change might be acknowledged positive to provide a more appropriate form of development in relationship with the dwelling house.

Despite such improvements against the refused development, it is considered that the proposals persist in failing on the materials considerations contained in the reasons for refusals.

The footprint of the structure will remain large. The height will be even increased by nearly 1 metre further and sharp angle of the gable pitched will exacerbate the prominence of the building onto the street scene. No harm will be perceived from the adjoining Granville Terrace because of the high mature hedge that obscure views onto the structure.

With regards to the external materials, timber cladding will remain across all elevations which is at odds with the character of the local area. Facing brickwork predominates the visual appearance of other properties in the vicinity. The wide use of timber for the external walls of such sized outbuilding at such prominent location onto the street scene will appear uncharacteristic in relation with other properties in the surroundings.

Furthermore, the inappropriateness of the scale and appearance of the development should be read in accordance with the current features on the street scene. No outbuildings of significant scale have been observed to the front of the properties along the frontage development onto Bridge Road neither Granville Terrace.

In summary, the house extension might contribute to improve the design of the current outbuilding but the proposals for roof replacement, external wall treatment and the keeping of the outbuilding at such prominent location will make the development still unsympathetic with the character of the area.

Conclusion

Taking into account the considerations above, the proposal fails to comply with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019; and Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019.

It is accordingly recommended to refuse this planning application via delegated powers.

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.