

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H23-0451-22 **Applicant:** L Brooks

Proposal: Proposed extensions to bungalow

Location: Willowcroft Ravens Bank Whaplode St Catherine

Terminal Date: 13th July 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. Achieving well-designed places

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a householder application seeking permission for single storey side and rear extensions to create 2no bedrooms, kitchen/dining room, shower room and a utility. The extension would have a side projection of 3.3 metres and a rear projection of 5.8 metres. The external materials would match the existing dwelling.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is located on Ravens Bank in Whaplode St Catherine. The site is located within the settlement boundary and backs onto open countryside. It comprises a white rendered detached bungalow. There is a gravelled driveway to the front/side. The site is enclosed by a low level boundary fence. To the east of the site is a new built two storey dwelling and to the west is a bungalow. The immediate area comprises a mixture of single and two storey, detached and semi-detached dwellings in varying designs and materials.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

REPRESENTATIONS

No representations received.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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 are considered proportionate to the existing bungalow. The side extension with a flush finish can on balance be accepted in this instance given the property is detached and its separation distance from the neighbouring property. As such it would not result in a terracing effect. In addition, it would have a small side projection therefore it would have an element of subservience.

The proposed rear extensions are also considered subservient as they would not extend beyond the existing rear conservatory so they would in effect be infill extensions. The extensions would not result in overdevelopment of the site and would retain a sufficient amount of outdoor amenity space. Furthermore the use of matching external materials and roof design would ensure the extensions are in keeping with the character of the existing bungalow.

As such the extension would comply with the aforementioned policies on design, layout and impact upon the character of the local area.

Impacts upon Residential Amenity

Paragraph 130 of National Planning Policy Framework (2021) amongst other matters seeks places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policies 2 and 3 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) set out residential amenity and relationship to existing development and land uses as main considerations when making planning decisions.

The closest neighbour to the proposed development is the newly constructed two storey dwelling to the east of the application site. The side extension would bring the application dwelling 3.3 metres closer to this neighbour. However the closest part of the proposed development would be sited approximately 1.5 metres from the shared boundary and a further 4 metres from its side elevation given this neighbour has a driveway located along the shared boundary with the application site. This separation distance is considered sufficient as to not result in any overbearing impact or unacceptable overshadowing, especially given the single storey nature of the extension and its limited height.

With regards to the neighbour to the west of the application site (Shieldon) the side extension would not be visible to this neighbour as it would be blocked by the applicants existing house. Only the rear projecting element would be visible to this neighbour. This element would be located some 4.5 metres from the shared boundary with this neighbour and approximately 6.8 metres from its side elevation. Given the single storey nature of the extension, this separation distance is considered to

be sufficient as to not result in any overbearing impact or unacceptable overshadowing.

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 proposal would create 2no additional bedrooms in the property, increasing the bedrooms from 2 to 4 therefore the parking requirement for the site would increase from 2 to 3. At least 3no off-street parking spaces would be retained in the driveway to the front/side. As such the scheme complies with the parking standards.

Planning Balance

The proposal will not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, amenity of nearby residents or parking issues. 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, 36 and Appendix 6 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.