

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H23-0633-19 **Applicant:** Mrs C Stockwell
Proposal: Proposed extension
Location: Oxton House 54 Stockwell Gate West Whaplode
Terminal Date: 19th August 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	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This a householder planning application for a proposed extension to the property Oxton House, 54 Stockwell Gate West, Whaplode, Spalding.

The proposal is for a two-storey side extension to accommodate an enlarged kitchen/diner and 2 additional bedrooms. Materials are proposed to match existing.

Site Description

The application site is located in a rural area where built development is sparse. The property the subject of this application is an old two-storey semi-detached hip roofed dwelling. To the east is a

large agricultural building and old detached farmhouse. Dwellings are set well back from the highway.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Ward member

Due to the location and fact that this is within the curtilage of the applicant do not have an issue with the concept of an extension; but do question whether the size involved could be deemed:

- Unsympathetic with regard to the existing property;
- An intrusion in the locality;
- The total finished building would be obtrusive/incongruous in the locality; and
- An overdevelopment of the site.

Whaplode Parish Council

Agree in principle but need to consider if overdevelopment of the site.

Resident

One representation has been made raising that the existing septic tank only serves 2 no. 3 bedroom houses and two additional bedrooms would present further people in the house, and ultimately, further sewage to dispose.

Planning Considerations

Design and layout

Most of the existing side/rear single storey lean-to extension would be demolished in order to erect the proposed development.

The new extension would protrude approximately 5.70 metres from the original western side wall of the building. It would extend roughly 13 metres along this elevation. The maximum ridge height would be slightly lower than that of the existing house. The eaves would be as high as those existing in the property as well as the adjacent semi-detached dwelling. The house enlargement would appear to be slightly stepped back from the front elevation. The roof pitch would fall below the main ridgeline. Therefore, it is concluded that the intended extension would be subservient to the host property and, in turn, to the adjacent semi-detached house in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

Sufficient separation distances are provided between the development and the site boundaries. The footprint and scale of the development would sit well within the residential plot. It is thus considered that the proposed extension would not result in overdevelopment.

The floor layout plans show a large combined kitchen/diner room on the ground floor level and 2 no. additional bedrooms would be created on the first floor level. Given the scale and nature of the property, the development is considered to be acceptable.

The saltbox element on the rear elevation would remain and the roof of the extension would be hipped in keeping with the current roof of the property. The external materials are stated to match those existing in the building. For these reasons, the overall design and appearance of the development would be sympathetic to the house as well as adjacent semi-detached dwelling.

Impact upon residential amenity

No residential properties are adjoining the applicant's property except the adjacent semi-detached house at No. 52.

The development would extend to the opposite side of the adjacent dwelling and would not exceed the rear elevation of the pair of houses. The number and scale of the proposed bedrooms indicate

that no significant increase of house occupiers would take place should permission be granted for the proposal. For these reasons, no harm upon the amenity standards of residents is anticipated.

Conclusion

In light of considerations above, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 and Section 12 of National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

It is therefore recommended to approve this planning application via delegated powers.

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.