

## DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

**Application No:** H23-0573-24      **Applicant:** Mr M Waldowski

**Proposal:** Proposed rear single storey extension, garage conversion and internal alterations

**Location:** 4 Cobgate Close Whaplode Spalding

**Terminal Date:** 30th August 2024

### Planning Policies

#### South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

|            |                                                 |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 01         | Spatial Strategy                                |
| 02         | Development Management                          |
| 03         | Design of New Development                       |
| 33         | Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network |
| 36         | Vehicle and Cycle Parking                       |
| APPENDIX 6 | Parking Standards                               |

#### National Guidance

#### National Planning Policy Framework 2023

Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport  
Section 12 - Achieving well designed and beautiful places

### Representations:

|                                       | Object | Support | No Obj. | Comments |
|---------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|----------|
| PARISH COUNCIL                        | 0      | 1       | 0       | 0        |
| WARD MEMBER                           | 0      | 0       | 0       | 0        |
| HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT               | 0      | 0       | 0       | 1        |
| SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD | 0      | 0       | 0       | 1        |
| SHDC INTERNAL                         | 0      | 0       | 1       | 0        |

## **CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT**

### **Description of Proposal**

The proposal seeks planning permission for the creation of a single storey rear extension as well as a garage conversion at 4 Cobgate Close, Whaplode. The rear extension would replace, and then extend beyond, an existing conservatory.

The rear extension would measure 9.2 metres (width) by 2.8 metres (depth). It would feature a flat roof of height 2.8 metres, consistent with an existing rear flat roof component. The extension would project east of this aforementioned existing flat roof portion of the dwelling. Three rear facing windows are proposed; however, these are all in comparable positions to existing units. It is proposed that a pair of French doors would replace an existing rear facing window.

In addition to the rear extension, a garage conversion is proposed. This would result in the roof of the existing garage being raised by approximately 600mm, to create a uniform flat roof height. A window would be added to the front elevation, in place of the existing garage door.

It is proposed that "LBC Dapple Light Brick" would be used alongside grey fibreglass roofing. White UPVC doors and windows are proposed, to match the host.

### **Site Description**

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Whaplode, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The site is located towards the south-west of the settlement, within a residential area. To the immediate south of the site is open agricultural land, while on all other sides are residential properties.

4 Cobgate Close is typical of the area, being a small bungalow constructed of light grey brick. While there are two-storey properties in the wider area, 4 Cobgate Close is one of 4 similar appearing bungalows at the end of the cul-de-sac.

### **Relevant History**

No relevant history.

### **Consultation Responses**

The responses received from consultees during the initial consultation exercises, which can be viewed in their entirety through the South Holland website, can be summarised as follows:

#### **South Holland Internal Drainage Board**

"Having reviewed the documents uploaded to support the application, I can confirm that whilst the site in question lies within the Internal Drainage District of the South Holland Internal Drainage Board (IDB), the proposed application does not meet our criteria for commenting as per our Planning and Byelaw Strategy. Therefore, the Board has no comments to make."

#### **Whaplode Parish Council**

Support- no comment

#### **Environmental protection**

No observations

#### **Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority**

"Parking needs to be demonstrated on the proposed block plan."

### **Public Representations**

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, no letters of representation have been received.

## **Key Planning Considerations**

### Evaluation

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, December 2023 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

### Principle of Development

Policy 1 of the SELLP sets out the settlement hierarchy in respect of delivering sustainable development, which meets the social and economic needs of the area whilst protecting and enhancing the environment; in order to provide enough choice of land for housing to satisfy local need, whilst making more sustainable use of land, and to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural plots by developing in sustainable locations and at appropriate densities.

Policy 1 expresses this sustainable hierarchy of settlements, ranking the settlements deemed to be most sustainable in descending order. The most sustainable locations for development are situated within the 'Sub-Regional Centres', followed by 'Main Service Centres'. Lower down the hierarchy are areas of limited development opportunity including Minor Service Centres, with areas of development constraint comprising 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. The countryside is at the bottom of the settlement hierarchy and represents the least sustainable location.

The site is within the settlement of Whaplode which is classed as minor service centre within Policy 1. As such development will be permitted that supports Whaplode's role as a service centre, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities.

In any event, the proposal solely relates to the extension of an existing and established residential dwelling and therefore, the principle of such development is considered to be appropriate, comprising an appropriate form of development for the location.

As such, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the requirements of the SELLP when viewed in principle. This is subject to the assessment against site specific criteria; including (but not limited to) the impact of the proposal on the character or appearance of the area, impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers, and impact on highway safety, which are discussed in turn in the following sections.

### Layout, Design, Scale and Consideration of the Character of the Area

Section 12 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed and beautiful places", states that the "creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve" and as such, it is generally accepted that good design plays a key role towards sustainable development.

Paragraph 135, contained within Section 12 of the NPPF, states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area (including beyond the short term) and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. This goes on to establish that it is important that new development should be of the highest quality, to enhance and reinforce good design characteristics, and that decisions must have regard towards the impact that the proposed development would have on local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting such as topography, street patterns, building lines,

boundary treatment and through scale and massing. Developments should 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 outlines sustainable development considerations for proposals; providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals. Furthermore, Policy 3 of the SELLP requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

These policies accord with the provisions of the NPPF and require 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. Proposals for new development would therefore require the aforementioned considerations to be adequately assessed and designed, including the siting, design, and scale to be respectful of surrounding development and ensure that the character of the area is not compromised.

While flat roof extensions are generally considered to be undesirable, they are extremely common within residential areas such as this and are well established in the vicinity. As such, the extension would not appear out of keeping with the character of the area. The use of materials which are indistinguishable from the host would further integrate the development with the area.

The increase in the height of the garage roof would not appear out of keeping with the area. The existing stepped roof height is somewhat of a visual anomaly and its removal would, to a certain extent, bring the dwelling more in line with the area. The height, while marginally greater than that of the eaves of the pitch roof, would not appear incongruous. The installation of the front facing window would again be in keeping with the area.

Taking account of the design, scale, and nature of the development, as detailed above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable. The proposal would not cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area and would therefore be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF.

#### Impacts Upon Resident Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that development should 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.

Policies 2 and 3 of SELLP sets out that residential amenity and the relationship to existing development and land uses is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

The proposed rear facing windows would face solely onto the fields to the rear of the dwelling. As such, there is limited opportunities for overlooking to occur. Likewise, the north facing frontage window would face into the public realm, ensuring no loss of privacy occurs.

The proposed extension and increase in roof height do not represent significant overshadowing concerns. The relatively low lying nature of the extensions reduces the possibility of overshadowing significantly, especially when coupled with the separation distance to the neighbouring property.

As detailed above, the scale and design of the proposal is considered to have no significant or unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties or land users, when also taking account of the conditions recommended. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with the Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan in terms of impact upon residential amenity.

#### Highway Safety and Parking

Section 9 of the NPPF is titled 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Within this, Paragraph 115 advises that "development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe".

In respect of highway matters, Policy 2 details that proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to access and vehicle generation. Policy 3 details that development proposals will demonstrate how accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways will be secured, where they are relevant to the proposal. Policy 33 further reinforces the need for developments to be accessible via sustainable modes of transport.

Policy 36 of the SELLP, in conjunction with Appendix 6, sets out minimum vehicle parking standards and requires at least two spaces for dwellings of up to three bedrooms and three spaces for dwellings with four or more bedrooms.

To a certain extent, the alterations to the parking arrangements could be achieved via permitted development. That being said, it is considered that adequate parking space has been provided on the site in order to ensure no harmful highway impact.

The proposal would therefore be acceptable and would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety in accordance with Policies 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Section 9 of the NPPF.

### **Planning Balance**

As detailed above, Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposal represents appropriate development within the defined settlement boundary. The development hereby proposed does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or amenity of nearby residents, and provides adequate parking, whilst conforming with the SELLP and the provisions of the NPPF when viewed as a whole.

### **Conclusion**

Taking these factors into consideration, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3, 33 and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 9 and 12 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the benefits of the proposal; therefore, the planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

### **Recommendation**

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be approved under Delegated Authority.

### **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.