DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H18-0992-21**	**Applicant:**	**Mr L Bornman**
Proposal:	Two storey extension & alterations		
Location:	340 Bridge Road Sutton Bridge Spalding		
Terminal Date:	8th December 2021		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
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 2021

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
RESIDENTS	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a householder application seeking permission for ground floor and first floor side and rear

extensions. The ground floor extension would measure 1.3 metres (depth) x 5.1 metres (width). The first floor element would measure 4 metres (depth) x 5.1 metres (width). The ground floor side extension would measure between 3.6 metres and 4.6 metres in width and 7.1 metres in depth. The first floor side extension would measure 3.7 metres (width) x 5.7 metres (depth). The external materials are to be confirmed.

It should be noted that the initial scheme proposed a bedroom on the ground floor level and this has been amended and changed back to a living room.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on Bridge Road in Sutton Bridge. The property is located outside any settlement boundary and within the open countryside. The dwelling is pebble dash rendered with blue window frames. The main amenity space for the dwelling is to the north-west. The site is enclosed by a hedge. The property currently mirrors the attached semi which also appears to remain untouched since it was built.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

REPRESENTATIONS

Sutton Bridge Parish Council

The Parish advised that residents neighbouring the development's location should be consulted.

Public

A representation has been received recommending installation of a minimum of 3no swift nest bricks be required by a planning condition to provide enhancement for biodiversity.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

The site is outside any settlement boundary but the development would be within the existing residential curtilage of the existing dwelling therefore the principle of a house extension that is incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse 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.

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 rear extensions would only offer limited views from the open countryside to the rear. The design of the rear extensions is considered satisfactory and the roof ridge of the extension sitting lower than the existing would give it an element of subservience. The size of the extensions is proportionate to the existing dwelling and the plot. The site is big enough to comfortably accommodate the proposed extensions without resulting in overdevelopment of the site and would also retain an adequate amount of outdoor amenity space to the north-east of the dwelling.

The proposed side extension initially proposed was not considered acceptable as the design and positioning of the windows on the front elevation was out of keeping with the existing windows and

resulted in an out of character and messy front elevation. As such the windows have been amended and the revised scheme is considered much more in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling. In addition, the side extension would be set back from the existing front elevation and the roof ridge would sit lower than the existing giving it and element of subservience.

The external materials have not been specified therefore a condition is appended requiring the submission of these at a later stage.

As such the proposed development is considered to comply with the aforementioned policies on design, layout and impact upon the character of the local area.

Impacts upon Residential Amenity

Given the remote location of the property the only immediate neighbour is the attached neighbour at no. 338 Bridge Road. No.338 is also under the applicants ownership and there is a separate application for similar rear extensions at this property. As such the proposed rear extensions would not extend beyond the proposed rear elevation of this neighbour therefore no overbearing impact or unacceptable overshadowing would result on this property. The side extension would not be visible to this neighbour as it would not extend beyond the front/rear elevations of the existing two storey dwelling therefore it would not be visible to number 338. As such this aspect is also considered acceptable.

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 initial scheme increased the number of bedrooms within the property from 3 to 4 therefore the parking requirement for the site also increased. The site does not currently have any off-street parking provision therefore the scheme was unacceptable on parking grounds. As such the bedroom initially proposed on the ground floor level has been changed back into a living room. The revised scheme does not increase the number of bedrooms in the property or the parking requirement for the site therefore the scheme could not reasonably be resisted on this basis.

The initial scheme also proposed a new access off Bridge Road and a driveway to the front to create one off-street parking space. This aspect has now been omitted.

Other matters

A representation has been received from a third party recommending installation of a minimum of three swift nest bricks to provide enhancement for biodiversity. The comments are noted, and a condition recommended to this effect.

Planning Balance

The proposal will not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, amenity of nearby residents or highway implications. 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 1, 2, 3, 28 and 36 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and Sections 12 and 15 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.