DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H23-0714-23**	**Applicant:**	**Ms T Smith**
Proposal:	Extension to Bungalow - approved under H23-0332-23. Modification of Condition 2 to allow amendments to previously approved plans.		
Location:	Lynton Pillars Main Road Whaplode Drove		
Terminal Date:	5th October 2023		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
04	Approach to Flood Risk
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a Section 73 modification application seeking to alter Condition 2 of H23-0332-23. It is proposed that length of the extension would increase by 1800mm. This would bring the total length of the extension to 11,140mm. No other changes are proposed.

Site Description

The application site is located on Main Road in Whaplode Drove, outside any defined settlement boundary. It comprises a detached buff brick-built bungalow set some 22 metres back from the road. There is a detached garage to the side and large gravelled driveway to the front providing ample off-street parking. The site is enclosed by boundary hedging/planting.

Relevant History

H23-0332-23 - Full. Extension to bungalow. Approved 31/05/23.

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:

Whaplode Parish Council

Support the application.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board

"The Board's Officers have reviewed the documents submitted in support of the above planning application. Officers have noted works which may require Land Drainage Consent from the Board as outlined in the table below and detailed overleaf. Please be aware of the potential for conflict between the planning process and the Board's regulatory regime."

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 Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, 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, 2023 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

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

Section 12 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", states that " 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 130, 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 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 National Planning Policy Framework 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.

The proposed change in length would not exacerbate any concerns raised in the original application. The proposal would still appear in keeping with the character of the area and would be appear well blended into the fabric of the host. The scale is still in proportion to the host dwelling and could be well accommodated within the plot.

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 130 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 proposal would not exacerbate any amenity concerns raised in the original application. A separation distance of 4.7 metres to the neighbouring boundary would be maintained, which is considered to be sufficient due to the relative low height of the dwelling. A distance of over 11 metres is maintained to the closest elevation of the neighbouring dwelling. As such, the increase in the size of the extension would not increase the potential for overshadowing or overlooking.

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 111 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 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.

The proposed increase in scale would not impact upon any the parking or access arrangements. Sufficient parking space will still be maintained.

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

Drainage

Policy 4 of the SELLP relates to flood risk management and states that new development will be permitted if appropriate flood resistance and resilience measures are proposed (criterion c); it incorporates the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) (criterion e); and demonstrates that adequate foul water treatment and disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development (criterion g).

The proposed alteration would have no significant impact upon drainage arrangements. As such, the considerations raised in the initial application are still entirely relevant. The requested informative note will be attached once more.

The proposal conforms to Policy 4 of the SELLP on drainage.

Planning Balance

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

The proposed increase in the length of the extension by 1800mm would not significantly exacerbate any concerns raised during the initial application (H23-0332-23). The proposal would still appear well blended into the fabric of the dwelling. The scale of the works would still appear well proportioned to the plot and the host. The extension would not lead to any additional overshadowing or overlooking.

The proposal would not significantly alter drainage rates. No additional rooms would be created; therefore, no alterations are required to the approved parking arrangements.

As such, the proposal conforms to Policies 2, 3, 4, 36 and Appendix of the SELLP as well as Sections 9, 12 and 14 of the NPPF. The planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

The recommendation is for delegated approval.

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.