DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H14-0838-20**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs Smith**
Proposal:	First floor side extension and single storey front extension		
Location:	11 Rose Lane Pinchbeck Spalding		
Terminal Date:	24th November 2020		

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 2019

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

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 full application for a first floor side extension and single storey front extension at 11 Rose Lane, Pinchbeck. The application seeks to provide a minor garage extension to the front of the property, alongside a porch beyond the front door. Also at ground level, the existing utility room will become a shower room, with a utility room extension to the rear. Above this development a bathroom is to be relocated, with an additional bedroom and an en-suite to be provided. First floor

fenestration is sited to the front and rear, with a small window serving the en-suite to be obscure glazed on the side elevation. Brick and tile is to match that of the existing dwelling and would be conditioned as such.

Site Description

The proposal is within defined settlement limits and the surrounding area is characterised by dwellings of a similar age and varying design.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Pinchbeck Parish Council

Support.

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The proposal is for residential development on residential land within defined settlement limits. Therefore, the principle of development on this land is considered to be acceptable.

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 2 titled - Development Management. This policy states:

"Proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to:
1. size, scale, layout, density and impact on the amenity, trees, character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development and land uses;
2. quality of design and orientation;
3. maximising the use of sustainable materials and resources;
4. access and vehicle generation levels;
5. the capacity of existing community services and infrastructure;
6. impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion;
7. sustainable drainage and flood risk;
8. impact or enhancement for areas of natural habitats and historical buildings and heritage assets;
9. impact on the potential loss of sand and gravel mineral resources."

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

1. The size, scale and layout is commensurate with the size of the site and host dwelling. The amenity of the occupants or neighbours is not considered to be impacted by the extension. The proposal will not impact any trees or the character and appearance of the area, which is predominately residential in use.

2. The design is in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. The orientation is a standard front and rear orientation extension and is predominately above existing single-storey development. The new gable roof will be in keeping with the existing arrangement.

3. The proposal does not seek to maximise the use of sustainable materials as the proposed materials are to match those of the dwelling. This is considered to benefit the overall design.

4. As the garage extension to the front is small, and the garage is to remain in garage use, there is not considered to be an impact on access or vehicle generation levels. The level of parking provision remains unaffected.

5. The proposal will not impact on existing community services and infrastructure.

6. Neighbouring properties will not be impacted by noise, odour or disturbance. The neighbouring property at 11a Rose Lane has a side elevation first floor bathroom window which is obscure

glazed. This is not considered to be impacted by the side elevation first floor en-suite window which will also be obscure glazed. The first floor extension windows of the bathroom to the front and bedroom to the rear are not considered to contribute to a material overlooking aspect as they constitute a standard frontage and rear orientation. There is not considered to be a material overbearing aspect toward 11a Rose Lane from the two storey extension to the rear. This is due to the proximity of the existing dwelling to the extension and that the extension is sited to the north of the dwelling. Therefore, as the sun travels east to west on a southerly trajectory there is not considered to be a material loss of light from an extension projecting in a northerly direction.

7. Sustainable drainage and flood risk is not considered to be adversely impacted by the proposal.

8. Natural habitats, historical buildings and heritage assets are unaffected by the proposal.

9. Sand and gravel mineral resources are unaffected by the proposal.

It is considered that when assessed against the above criteria, the proposal accords with SELLP Policy 2.

Accordance with Policy 3 of the SELLP - Design of New Development

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 3 titled - Design of New Development. This policy states:

All development will create distinctive places through the use of high quality and inclusive design and layout and, where appropriate, make innovative use of local traditional styles and materials. 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.
Development proposals will demonstrate how the following issues, where they are relevant to the proposal, will be secured:
1. creating a sense of place by complementing and enhancing designated and non designated heritage assets; historic street patterns; respecting the density, scale, visual closure, landmarks, views, massing of neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area;
2. distinguishing between private and public space;
3. the landscape character of the location;
4. accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways;
5. the provision of facilities for the storage of refuse/recycling bins, storage and/or parking of bicycles and layout of car parking;
6. the lighting of public places;
7. ensuring public spaces are accessible to all;
8. crime prevention and community safety;
9. the orientation of buildings on the site to enable the best use of decentralised and renewable low-carbon energy technologies for the lifetime of the development;
10. the appropriate treatment of facades to public places, including shop frontages to avoid visual intrusion by advertising, other signage, security shutters, meter boxes and other service and communication infrastructure;
11. residential amenity;
12. the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resistant and flood-resilient design and sustainable drainage systems (SuDS);
13. the use of locally sourced building materials, minimising the use of water and minimising land take, to protect best and most versatile soils;
14. the incorporation of existing hedgerows and trees and the provision of appropriate new landscaping to enhance biodiversity, green infrastructure, flood risk mitigation and urban cooling;
15. the appropriate use or reuse of historic buildings.

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

1. The size and scale of the proposed extension is commensurate with the size of the site and host dwelling. It is not out of keeping with surrounding development in terms of design and layout. Non-designated heritage assets and landmarks are unaffected by this proposal.

2. The proposed extension clearly sits within the curtilage of the existing dwelling, and is set back from the road, thus the distinction between public and private space is not adversely impacted.

3. The area is predominantly residential and thus landscape character will be unaffected by the proposal.

4. The proposal is for an extension to an existing dwelling, therefore the sites accessibility via various means of transport is not considered relevant to this application.

5. The existing garage is to remain in use as a garage and space for two vehicles on the driveway will be retained. Therefore the level of parking provision is unaffected.

6. The lighting of public spaces will not be affected by this proposal.

7. The proposal does not impact accessibility to public spaces.

8. Crime prevention and community safety is not impacted by this proposal.

9. The proposal is for an extension to an existing dwelling, therefore this criterion is not considered to be relevant to this application.

10. Facades, signage and advertising is not impacted by this proposal.

11. Residential amenity is not considered to be adversely impacted by this proposal. As previously discussed, overlooking/loss of privacy is not considered to be an issue for the reasons outlined earlier. The proposed first floor extension is located to the east/west of neighbouring properties and thus there should be no detrimental overshadowing/loss of light.

12. The proposal is for an extension to an existing dwelling, therefore the Environment Agency Flood Zones and South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017) are not considered relevant to the application. Surface water can be adequately dealt with by soakaways.

13. The development is on brownfield land thus best and most versatile soils will be protected. Where materials will be sourced from is unknown.

14. No trees or hedging will be removed to facilitate this development.

15. Historic buildings will not be affected by the proposal.

When assessed against the above criteria the proposal is considered to accord with SELLP Policy 3.

Conclusion

The proposal accords with Policies 1, 2, 3, 36 and Appendix 6 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

The recommendation is 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.