DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H23-0798-22**	**Applicant:**	**Mr L Hartley**
Proposal:	Proposed Single Storey Side Extension and Internal Alterations		
Location:	Southside Ravens Bank Gedney		
Terminal Date:	7th October 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	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a householder application seeking permission to demolish the existing garage to the side and erection of a single storey side extension to extend the kitchen and living room. The extension would measure 3.6 metres (width) x 7.4 metres (depth) and stand at 4.8 metres in height (2.4 metres to the eaves). The external materials would match the existing dwelling.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is located on Ravens Bank in Gedney. It comprises a small detached buff brick built bungalow. There is a single attached flat roofed garage to the side with a driveway to the front. The site has an open frontage and high level trees form the southern, eastern and western boundaries. Little South Holland Drain lies to the north of the site with one countryside beyond this. The immediate street comprises mainly bungalows sitting on modest sized plots.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

REPRESENTATIONS

Whaplode Parish Council

Supports the application.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

The site is within the Gedney settlement boundary and the proposed extension would be sited within the residential curtilage of the existing dwelling therefore the principle of extending the existing dwellinghouse is acceptable.

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, states that the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The key material considerations are addressed below.

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 extension is considered proportionate to the existing bungalow. The extension would have a small side projection (similar to the existing garage) therefore it would not appear overly prominent in relation to the existing bungalow. The roof ridge would sit at the same height as the existing bungalow which can be accepted in this instance given the bungalow is detached and there is a significant separation distance to the neighbouring property therefore no terracing effect would result. In addition, the use of matching external materials would ensure the extension is 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 to the west (Riverview) and the proposed extension would be sited at least 10 metres from this neighbour boundary. Given the single storey nature of the extension and its modest footprint this separation distance is considered sufficient as to not result in any overbearing impact or unacceptable overshadowing. in addition. There are high level trees along the western boundary therefore the proposed extension would not be visible to this neighbour

With regards to the neighbour to the east at Fenside the proposed extension would not be visible to this neighbour as the extension would not extend beyond the front/rear elevations of the existing bungalow therefore it would be blocked by the existing bungalow.

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).

Highway safety and car parking provision

In conjunction with Policy 36 of SELLP 2019, Appendix 6 sets out the minimum standards for parking provision upon the use class. The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms within the property therefore the parking requirement would remain the same. It would result in loss of the single garage, however, there is sufficient space for at least 4no vehicles in the driveway to the front. As such the site exceeds the current parking standards.

Planning Balance

The proposal will not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, the amenity of nearby residents or result in parking implications. 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.