DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H14-0067-22**	**Applicant:**	**Mr B Elliott**
Proposal:	Extension and Alterations to Bungalow		
Location:	8 Crossgate Crescent Pinchbeck Spalding		
Terminal Date:	25th March 2022		

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 2021

12 - Achieving well-designed places

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a householder application at 8 Crossgate Crescent, Pinchbeck for extensions and alterations to the bungalow on site. The proposal seeks to provide a bathroom and a kitchen. The extension is to project a further two metres to the west from the existing projection on site, and will not extend further into the garden. A pitched roof will cover the existing rear projection and extended area. The proposed eaves are 2.4 metres with a ridge height of 4.4 metres. This extension is subservient in height to the existing ridge height of 5.05 metres. Brick and tile is to match that of the existing dwelling and would be conditioned as such.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is within defined settlement limits and the surrounding area is characterised by dwellings of a similar age and varying designs. The dwelling is to the south of the proposal, with 9 Crossgate Crescent to the west, 69 Gallery Walk to the north-west, a field to the north recently granted approval for 38 dwellings under H14-0328-21, and 7 Crossgate Crescent sited to the east. The site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3, and in a "Danger for Most" hazard with a maximum predicted flood depth of 0.5 metres on the 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. As this application is for an extension to the existing bungalow there is not a requirement to raise finished floor levels to address flood risk.

RELEVANT HISTORY

No relevant history.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Pinchbeck Parish Council

Support

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

This application is for residential development on residential land within defined settlement limits. The principle of development in this location is considered to be appropriate.

Assessment against SELLP Policy 2 - Development Management

When assessed against the relevant criteria the following can be observed:

1. The size, scale and layout of the proposed extension is considered to be appropriate for the site. No trees will be removed to facilitate this proposal. The extension is to the rear of the dwelling and will not impact the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

2. The proposed design is subservient in height to the existing dwelling and is location to the rear of the building.

3. Brick and tile is to match that of the existing dwelling and will be conditioned as such. This is considered to benefit the appearance of the dwelling.

4. The existing access and vehicle generation levels are not impacted by the proposal.

5. Existing community services and infrastructure will not be impacted by this proposal.

6. There is not considered to be a noise, odour or disturbance impact from this proposal. With regard to visual intrusion the following can be observed:

Overdevelopment - The proposed extension does not project further into the garden than the existing projection. Ample amenity space remains to the rear of the site. There is not an overdevelopment impact from this proposal.

Overbearing / Overshadowing - The proposed extension is 8 metres from 9 Crossgate Crescent to the west so there is not considered to be an overshadowing impact in that direction. The extension is 19.17 metres from the northern boundary so there is not considered to be an overshadowing impact to the north. The existing eastern side elevation wall remains 0.44 metres from the eastern boundary with 7 Crossgate Crescent, with the ridge height of 4.4 metres being 3.7 metres from the boundary. The separation distance western elevation window of number 7 which is separated by a 1.6 metre high fence and faces the existing blank side elevation wall of the proposed kitchen area which is 2.4 metres high. The proposed roof is not considered to materially impact the three panel window to the north-east of the proposal when a right to light calculation is made.

Overlooking - There are no windows in the eastern elevation of the extension. The northern elevation has a window to serve the kitchen. This does not directly overlook the windows to the western elevation of 7 Crossgate Crescent. The western elevation will have a door serving the

kitchen and an obscure glazed window serving a bathroom. This fenestration faces the 1.8 metre high fence 6.128 metres away at the boundary with 9 Crossgate Crescent. Due to the distance and fence height there is not considered to be an overlooking aspect from the western elevation.

7. The site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3, and in a "Danger for Most" hazard with a maximum predicted flood depth of 0.5 metres on the 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. As this application is for an extension to the existing bungalow there is not a requirement to raise finished floor levels to address flood risk.

This application accords with SELLP Policy 2.

Assessment against SELLP Policy 3 - Design of New Development

When assessed against the relevant criteria the following can be observed:

1. A sense of place is not impacted by this proposal. The size, scale and layout of the proposed extension is considered to be appropriate for the site. No trees will be removed to facilitate this proposal. The extension is to the rear of the dwelling and will not impact the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

5. Ample space remains on site for cycle and bin storage. This application is for a rear extension so off road parking provision is not impacted.

11. There is not considered to be a noise, odour or disturbance impact from this proposal. With regard to visual intrusion the following can be observed:

Overdevelopment - The proposed extension does not project further into the garden than the existing projection. Ample amenity space remains to the rear of the site. There is not an overdevelopment impact from this proposal.

Overbearing / Overshadowing - The proposed extension is 8 metres from 9 Crossgate Crescent to the west so there is not considered to be an overshadowing impact in that direction. The extension is 19.17 metres from the northern boundary so there is not considered to be an overshadowing impact to the north. The existing eastern side elevation wall remains 0.44 metres from the eastern boundary with 7 Crossgate Crescent, with the ridge height of 4.4 metres being 3.7 metres from the boundary. The separation distance western elevation window of number 7 which is separated by a 1.6 metre high fence and faces the existing blank side elevation wall of the proposed kitchen area which is 2.4 metres high. The proposed roof is not considered to materially impact the three panel window to the north-east of the proposal when a right to light calculation is made.

Overlooking - There are no windows in the eastern elevation of the extension. The northern elevation has a window to serve the kitchen. This does not directly overlook the windows to the western elevation of 7 Crossgate Crescent. The western elevation will have a door serving the kitchen and an obscure glazed window serving a bathroom. This fenestration faces the 1.8 metre high fence 6.128 metres away at the boundary with 9 Crossgate Crescent. Due to the distance and fence height there is not considered to be an overlooking aspect from the western elevation.

12. The site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3, and in a "Danger for Most" hazard with a maximum predicted flood depth of 0.5 metres on the 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. As this application is for an extension to the existing bungalow there is not a requirement to raise finished floor levels to address flood risk.

This application accords with SELLP Policy 3.

PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed rear extension by virtue of the location and design is not considered to materially impact the character and amenity of the surrounding area. This application accords with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2021, as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2021.

CONCLUSION

This application is recommended for 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.