

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H20-0788-19 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs A Lenton
Proposal: Extension and Alterations
Location: 91 Chapel Gate Sutton St James Spalding
Terminal Date: 9th October 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
NORTH LEVEL INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
RESIDENTS	0	1	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application for extensions and alterations to the property at 91 Chapel Gate, Sutton St James, Spalding.

Site Description

The site is within the built-up area of Sutton St James and its settlement boundaries as shown in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.

The dwelling is one of a number of similarly designed semi-detached properties fronting Chapel Gate, all of traditional design with reddish brick exteriors. It sits within a well-defined frontage along the southern side of the road. A certain range of roof styles, house types and ages has been observed along both sides of the road during the site visit. There is a slope from the edge of the highway which is the site access. A gravel area used as a driveway is to the front of the property. The rear garden is fairly spacious bounded by a nearly 2 metre high timber close board fence. A brick party wall shared with the adjacent semi-detached house extends approximately 4 metres from the rear elevation.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Residents

One representation has been received supporting the proposal.

One further representation has not been submitted as an objection although it warns the impact of the intended render upon the character of the local area.

Sutton St James Parish Council

Supports this planning application.

North Level IDB

No objection.

Planning Considerations

Design and layout

The proposal entails the erection of two extensions to the house. A rear extension would be as wide as the existing host property. It would also protrude as much as the existing party wall. The nature of this extension would be single-storey and the eaves would be approximately 2.70 metres high. In addition to that, there would be a two-storey side extension protruding 2.70 metres from the western elevation. This extension would be as long as the side wall and as high as the existing house. It is therefore concluded that the proposed extensions would be subservient to the host property in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

The purpose of the development on the ground floor is to enlarge the kitchen, create new toilet and utility to the side and a sunroom to the rear. One additional bedroom and a bathroom would be created on the first floor. The loft space would be opened to accommodate one ensuite bedroom.

The ridgeline would be enlarged converting the hip pitch to a side gable with an internal height of 1.97 metres over the staircase to ensure safe and convenient access for house occupiers between lower floors and the loft bedroom. To ensure further enjoyment of daylight for the loft user, 3 no. roof lights would be opened on the front roof slope and one dormer window on the rear slope. A small porch with two columns would be erected to the main access.

The external walls of the entire house including the extensions would be rendered with K render in Pale grey. Tiles are proposed to match those existing in the house. Dark coloured UPVC would be used for new windows, gutters and downpipes. Such colours would contrast with the existing white UPVC fenestration providing somewhat variety in appearance without being visually adverse.

The proposed render would represent a significant alteration to the street scene. The frontage

where the property sits comprises pairs of semi-detached houses with reddish facing brickwork. There is a certain range of roof forms, from hip to gable, as well as brickwork with some chromatic variety. Given that the appearance of the street scene is not fully identical on the frontage, it is not considered that the render would have a material adverse impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area to the extent which would warrant refusal of planning permission.

Residential amenity

The side extension is set back from the western boundary by approximately 1m and the rear extension would have a distance of approximately 12m to the rear boundary. The adjacent property No. 93 is in close proximity to the western boundary. The distance between the side extension and its opposing elevation would be less than 2 metres. There is no opening on both elevations. Thus, no overbearing and overshadowing impact is anticipated.

Due to its siting, the rear extension would have some impact to the residential amenity of the neighbour living in the adjacent semi-detached house. However, the height of the rear extension would not be excessive in relation to the party wall and, therefore, no material adverse harm is anticipated in this respect.

Conclusion

There are no objections to the proposal. One representation raises concerns about the impact of the render upon the character of the area but it has not been submitted as an objection and the issue has been addressed in the assessment.

In light of the considerations above, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

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.