DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H14-0428-21**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs H Jude**
Proposal:	Extension & Alterations		
Location:	10 Knight Street Pinchbeck Spalding		
Terminal Date:	18th 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

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	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This full planning application is for the creation of a side-elevation infill/link extension between the single garage and the main property at 10 Knight Street, Pinchbeck.

The proposal would create a single storey, dual pitched roof extension creating a study and play room between the host property and the existing garage. It is also proposed that this proposal would add a dual pitch roof to the existing garage, to replace the existing flat roof.

Site Description

10 Knight Street is the Northernmost property in a block of 2 semi-detached 1930s properties, set within a central, prominent position within the Pinchbeck Conservation Area (PCA). The two properties are handsome examples of their type, but by no means unique locally.

The Grade II listed No.13 sits on the opposite side of the road to this site, but views between both properties are obscured by virtue of boundary treatments and placement within curtilages.

The area in general is characterised by a mix of residential and commercial properties, in the immediate area, most residential sites are of a similar era and pattern as the subject site.

History

None relevant

Consultation Responses

None received.

Planning Considerations

Design and Layout

The Local Planning Authority seeks no amendment to the design or layout of the proposal. The design of the proposed extension helps to enhance the appearance of the extant flat-roofed garage. The overall design is fairly standard and non-descript, being fairly typical of its type, fundamentally the design is fairly inoffensive and is deemed to be acceptable for the context of this site.

The proposed layout of the extension is deemed appropriate for the proposed use as a joint study/play room, with attached garage.

Heritage Impact

Whilst the proposed design is fairly standard, featuring little in terms of heritage-style features (apart from the inclusion of fascia boards on the eaves, matching the eaves of the rest of the property), it still helps to improve the setting of the site, mainly by introducing a slated dual pitch roof onto the extant, Later-C20th flat-roof garage, which without a pitched roof appears as an awkward unsightly addition to the overall site and surrounding context.

It is proposed that the windows will match the existing UPVC units on site in terms of material - whilst this is regrettable and usually best practice to avoid within Conservation Area settings, UPVC is already prevalent on this site, and therefore, it would be unreasonable to request the applicant to alter the form of the site by introducing a mismatch of materials.

By improving and softening the appearance of the ungainly garage structure, it is deemed that this proposal helps to enhance the setting of the Conservation Area, in accordance with Section 16 of the National Planning
Policy Framework (2019)

Residential Amenity

The Local Planning Authority does not consider there to be any additional risk to the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties presented by this proposal. This is because the proposed extension is only single storey in nature and of standard dimensions, meaning that no risk of overlooking or overshadowing is presented.

Planning Balance

Whilst it is regrettable that further UPVC windows will be introduced into the site, this material is already prevalent on site and the overall softening effect upon the site of the overall design outweighs this negative aspect of the proposal.

Conclusion

For the reasons listed above, it is determined that this application is in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 3 and 29 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.