DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H14-0289-21**	**Applicant:**	**Mr J Gray**
Proposal:	Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension and Detached Garage		
Location:	89 Church Street Pinchbeck Spalding		
Terminal Date:	3rd June 2021		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
29	The Historic Environment
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
RESIDENTS	2	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This full planning application is for the erection of a single storey rear extension and detached garage to the front of 89 Church Street, Pinchbeck. The proposed rear extension will be of a flat-

roofed, parapet wall style with end Bi-fold doors and a roof lantern, as well as a single, wide but slimline window mounted above eye height (clerestory) just below the eaves on either (North/South) side of the extension. The dimensions of this extension would be 4.5m x 5.616m.

The proposed garage would also form a part of the boundary of the property, constructed to the front of the house, with a dual pitched roof and no windows, with only a single, conventional lift-up garage door.

Site Description

The proposal site sits within the prominent, main egress and entrance point of Church Street within the conservation area for Pinchbeck (PCA). The site is opposite to the Grade II listed Pinchbeck Hall, and the gardens of that property are clearly visible from the front of the property.

The host property is a mid-late C20th semi-detached house which is of no particular contribution to the character of the PCA. The area in general is characterised mainly by C20th residential development along church street and to the rear along Horsepit Lane and Oakland Way. The notable exception being the forested parkland garden to Pinchbeck hall, situated on the Western side of Church Street.

History

None relevant

Consultation Responses

Local Residents

Objections were received from 2 local residents, their objections can be summarised as such;

-Risk of obstruction of light
-Impact upon views
-Garden area is not big enough to sustain an extension
-Frontage area is not big enough to sustain the proposed garage
-Noise generation and commotion caused by construction presents a risk to amenity and health of residents.
-Property devaluation

Pinchbeck Parish Council

Approves of the application.

Planning Considerations

Resident objections

The above outlined objections are addressed in order below;

-Overshadowing risk: It is not considered that there is any advanced risk of overshadowing presented by this application. Whilst both the proposed extension and garage respectively form construction within extreme proximity to the boundary, both are single storey in nature. There was some concern that with an unduly large pitched roof, the rear extension would perhaps present some risk, so this has been amended to a lower flat roof design. To the South, at 87 Church street, the extension replaces a pre-existing conservatory structure which is visible from the same aspect, meaning the structural mass on display will not be much greater than what already appears. The rear extension is considered to be far enough from 91 Church Street and small enough to be considered to have any bearing upon access to sunlight at all. Both neighbouring properties sit to the north or south of the proposal site, and so such works should not impact upon the main, east-west trajectory of the sun throughout the day.

The proposed garage is, again, single storey in nature and would be facing an elevation of 91 Church street which it would nearly border, which contains no windows.

-Impact upon views: Views within conservation areas are only protected where they actively

contribute to the character of the conservation area. Residents have raised concerns over purely private views, which are not considered to be a material planning concern.

-Garden Area: Both the rear and front gardens are considered to be sufficiently large to house both respective proposals, whilst leaving an ample amount of amenity and parking space.

-Construction disturbance: Construction related noise disturbance for such minor developments are not considered to be a material planning concern as the potential for some noise generation is inherent to any building project. The standard rules of reasonableness in terms of working hours and noise generation would apply as a default to such a project. The planning office does not recognise anything within this proposal which presents any undue or abnormal risk to health.

-Property devaluation: The effect on house values is not considered to be material to any planning application.

Heritage Impact

As the host site is a somewhat unremarkable example of C20th residential development, the plain style of both the extension and the garage is considered to be commensurate with the theme of the immediate area and therefore has no bearing upon the character of the conservation area. Whilst UPVC is proposed for the windows to this property, UPVC is already the prevalent form at this site, and the new windows would not be visible from the public realm. Due to the neutral impact upon the conservation area, this application is considered to help to conserve the historic environment in line with the requirements of Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Residential Amenity

The local planning authority does not consider there to be any risk to the residential amenity of any nearby property presented by this application. As discussed above in the 'resident objections' portion of the considerations section of this report, it is not considered that there is any enhanced risk of overshadowing presented by this proposal. With regards to overlooking, both proposed structures are single storey in nature. Whilst the rear elevation does have side elevation windows pointing, especially towards the back yard of the Southern neighbour, both of these side elevation windows are to be fitted in a clerestory fashion, meaning that they present no material risk of overlooking.

Parking provision

The proposal site currently has enough driveway to conceivably house 3 cars. This proposal seeks to take up 1 of those spaces with a parking garage. Therefore, this application proposes no change to the amount of parking provision available on-site.

Planning Balance

Whilst the provision of UPVC within the conservation area is regrettable, this material is already the primary window material on site and should not visually impact upon publicly visible elements of the PCA.

Conclusion

For the reasons listed above, this application is deemed to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 3, 29, 36 and appendix 6 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) as well as Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). Therefore, 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.