

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H14-0973-21 **Applicant:** K Chipperfield
Proposal: Single storey extension & alterations
Location: 22 Primrose Crescent Pinchbeck Spalding
Terminal Date: 19th November 2021

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

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

12 - Achieving well-designed places

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a householder application for a single storey extension and alterations at 22 Primrose Crescent, Pinchbeck. This application seeks to provide a slightly extended and widened porch to the front of the property which will have cedar cladding. The single storey rear extension will project approximately 4.5 metres from the original rear wall and be 7.7 metres in width, wrapping around the existing single storey element accommodating the dining room. The extension will be flat roofed with a roof lantern. The eaves height will be 2.8 metres, with a maximum roof lantern height of 3.6 metres. The proposed material of construction will be white render. It is also proposed to render the walls of the existing house, which is currently of buff brick.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is within defined settlement limits and the surrounding area is characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings of a similar age and design. The property is within Environment Agency Flood Zone 3, and is in a "Danger for Some" hazard area with a maximum predicted flood depth of 0.5 metres.

HISTORY

None relevant.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

None received.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Assessment against SELLP Policy 1 - Spatial Strategy

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 1 titled - Spatial Strategy. The relevant section in this policy is titled Main Service Centres. This section of the policy states:

"Within the settlement boundaries of the Main Service Centres (as shown on the Inset Maps) development will be permitted that supports their role as a service centre for the settlement itself, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities."

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

The proposal is for residential development on residential land and will help sustain existing facilities. The principle of development in this location is considered to be acceptable.

This application accords with SELLP Policy 1.

Assessment against SELLP Policy 2 - Development Management

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 relevant criteria the following can be observed:

1. The size, scale and layout of this proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location. No trees will be affected by this proposal. The proposed cedar cladding is acceptable in this location and does not materially impact the frontage of the property. Additionally, although rendering the whole of the property would change its appearance in a street of brick built dwellings there are a variety of brick types and tile hanging to front elevations is prevalent thus it is considered the white render would not impact the character of the property or surrounding area to such an extent as to be unacceptable.
2. The design and orientation is in keeping with the surrounding area.

3. The proposed materials whilst not the most sustainable are considered to benefit the overall design of the dwelling.
4. The access and vehicle generation levels are unaffected by this proposal.
5. The capacity of existing community services and infrastructure is unaffected 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 height and location of the extensions will not lead to an overlooking or overshadowing aspect. There is a first floor side elevation window at 24 Primrose Crescent facing the rear garden. As there are no side elevation windows in the rear extension there will not be an increased overlooking aspect to or from the extension towards no. 24. The frontage cedar cladding does not materially alter the visual appearance of the property or surrounding area.
7. The property is within Environment Agency Flood Zone 3, and is in a "Danger for Some" hazard area with a maximum predicted flood depth of 0.5 metres. There is not a requirement to raise finished floor levels as the alterations and extensions are on the existing property.

Assessment against SELLP Policy 3 - 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 relevant criteria the following can be observed:

1. The size, scale and layout of this proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location. No trees will be affected by this proposal. The proposed cedar cladding is acceptable in this location and does not materially impact the frontage of the property. Additionally, although rendering the whole of the property would change its appearance in a street of brick built dwellings there are a variety of brick types and tile hanging to front elevations is prevalent thus it is considered the white render would not impact the character of the property or surrounding area to such an extent as to be unacceptable.

The character and appearance of the surrounding area is not materially impacted by this proposal, nor is a sense of place.

5. Cycle and refuse storage, as well as car parking is not affected by this proposal.

11. There is not considered to be a noise, odour or disturbance impact from this proposal. With regard to visual intrusion, the height and location of the extensions will not lead to an overlooking or overshadowing aspect. There is a first floor side elevation window at 24 Primrose Crescent facing the rear garden. As there are no side elevation windows in the rear extension there will not be an increased overlooking aspect to or from the extension towards no. 24. The frontage cedar cladding does not materially alter the visual appearance of the property or surrounding area.

12. The property is within Environment Agency Flood Zone 3, and is in a "Danger for Some" hazard area with a maximum predicted flood depth of 0.5 metres. There is not a requirement to raise finished floor levels as the alterations and extensions are on the existing property.

PLANNING BALANCE

The proposed cedar cladding is acceptable in this location and does not materially impact the frontage of the property. Additionally, although rendering the whole of the property would change its appearance in a street of brick built dwellings there are a variety of brick types and tile hanging to front elevations is prevalent thus it is considered the white render would not impact the character of the property or surrounding area to such an extent as to be unacceptable. There is not considered be an amenity impact from these extensions and alterations. This application is considered to accord with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, 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.