

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H20-0779-19 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs M Ruffell
Proposal: Single-storey extension and alterations
Location: Midway Bardlings Drove Sutton St James
Terminal Date: 3rd November 2019

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

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 for single storey extension & alterations to the property Midway at Bardlings Drove, Sutton St James, Spalding.

Site Description

The site is based on an isolated location within the countryside. It is 3.58 km due south-west from Sutton St James and 3km due south-west from Holbeach St Johns.

The curtilage boundaries defines a rectangular shape. The building is a large two-storey dwelling set at an angle with the built footprint facing in a north-westerly direction. It is slightly set back from

Bardlings Drove. A sizeable rear garden is laid to lawn and extends to the south-east. A row of leafy tall trees is on the front section of the southern-west boundary. There is a nearly 2 metre high timber close board fence along the northern-east boundary with conifer at the front. The adjacent property beyond this boundary is a large detached bungalow.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Sutton St James Parish Council

Support.

Planning Considerations

Design and layout

The existing house is a large two-storey dwelling with a small-scale single-storey rear extension used as a utility room. The front elevation is partially set forward to accommodate a balcony on the first floor-level. The main roof is hipped with a front gable element.

The purpose of the development is to increase floor space to accommodate larger kitchen with utility and shower room. Internal alterations are proposed to relocate the dining room keeping similar size.

The proposed extension would protrude nearly 5 metres from the northern-east side wall of the house. It would measure approximately 11.35 metres in depth and 5.20 in maximum apex height. The eaves would be 2.40 metres high. Having regard the dimensions of the house, it is considered that the intended development would be subservient to the host property in terms of scale, massing and bulk.

A saltbox roof is proposed for the extension. There would be a slope which would come off from the existing roof edge downwards to the highest point of the eaves. The saltbox roof is well regarded as it blends with the roof layout of the host property and remarks the rural character of the area. The roof would also extend to the front elevation in a slopped form to replace the balcony. In addition with the saltbox, this element would represent an upgrade of the design and layout of the building as it stands. A small-scaled porch with dual pitched roof would be over the main access of the property.

Whilst cream colour render would be applied to existing facing brickwork of the house, the extension external walls would be treated with black coloured timber featheredge weatherboarding. The roof tiles of the extension would be tantamount with those of the house. The new windows and rear door would be made of Anthracite UPVC. It is deemed that the contrast with the current white coloured fenestration is acceptable and would not create any cumulative impact to the visual amenity. In view of the material schedule, the appearance of the development would be sympathetic with the host property and built environment in the surroundings.

Residential amenity

There would be a separation distance of 4.2 metres between the extension and the northern-east boundary. As mentioned above, there is a nearly 2 metre high timber close board fence along the northern-east boundary with overgrown conifer at the front. Except from a little roof light, no upper window would face the adjacent property to that direction. Given such boundary treatment and separation with the opposing elevation, it is anticipated no adverse effect of the development to the amenity standards of adjacent residents.

Conclusion

Taking into account the mentioned above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

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.