DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H19-1301-21**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs N Fisher**
Proposal:	Extension & Alterations		
Location:	184 Broadgate Sutton St Edmund Spalding		
Terminal Date:	10th February 2022		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Section 12

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	2
NORTH LEVEL INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	2

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a householder application seeking permission for single storey rear extensions with a rear projection of between 5.2 and 7.5 metres. The garage would be linked to the main house and converted into a bedroom with an en-suite shower room and a small lounge area. The external materials would match the existing dwelling.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site comprises a detached bungalow located on Broadgate in Sutton St Edmund. It is located outside any settlement boundary and within the open countryside. The site occupies a large plot and is surrounded by open countryside. The dwelling is set back from the front boundary by some 16 metres. The property is traditional buff brick construction with white window frames. To the front is a large gravelled driveway providing off-street parking provision for several vehicles.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

H19-0276-06 - Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of replacement bungalow - Approved

H19-1583-05 - Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of replacement bungalow incorporating rooms in the roof - Refusal

REPRESENTATIONS

South Holland Internal Drainage Board

The proposed application is not in the SHIDB area and is considered as a minor development therefore the SHIDB has not commented.

North Level Internal Drainage Board

No comments.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

The site is outside any defined settlement boundary, however, the proposed extension would be sited within the residential curtilage of the existing dwelling therefore the principle of extending the existing 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 proposed extensions and alterations would be to the rear of the site therefore no unacceptable impact would result on the street scene. There may be views from the open countryside to the north, east and south of the site, however, given the modest height of the extensions they would not appear overly prominent.

The development is considered to be proportionate to the existing dwelling and the plot. The design of the extensions is sympathetic and respect the design of the existing dwelling. The eaves would

sit lower than the existing bungalow, therefore providing an element of subservience.

The proposal is not considered to appear unduly incongruous within the rural street scene and would not materially harm the character/appearance of the locality. The proposed use of matching external materials would ensure the extension is in keeping with the existing dwelling.

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

There are no immediate neighbours given the remote location of the property therefore no unacceptable impact would result on neighbouring amenity.

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 increase the number of bedrooms in the property from 2 to 4, increasing the parking requirement for the site from 2 to 3 parking spaces. The site benefits from extensive parking to the front which 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, amenity of nearby residents or result in 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 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.