

DELEGATED ASSESSMENT

Application no: PA/2024/1203

Proposal: Planning permission to erect first floor and single storey rear extension including demolition of existing conservatory

Location: 83 Waterside Road, Barton Upon Humber, DN18 5BA

Applicant: Miss Virginia Lowe

Officer: Chris Clark

POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework:

Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

North Lincolnshire Local Plan:

DS1 – General Requirements
DS5 – Residential Extensions

North Lincolnshire Core Strategy:

CS3 – Development Limits
CS5 – Delivering Quality Design in North Lincolnshire
CS19 – Flood risk
SPG1 – Design Guidance for House Extensions

Housing and Employment Land Allocations Development Plan Document (2016):

Inset 42 – Scunthorpe

CONSULTATIONS

LLFA Drainage Team: The LLFA Drainage Team has no objections or comments to the proposed development.

Highways: Looking at the information provided the proposal is to demolish an existing conservatory and replace with a slightly larger extension which appears to be at the rear of the property, so with this in mind Highways have no objections to

this planning application.

Environmental Protection: Raised concerns around contamination relating to the existence of a historic landfill site located 250m away combined with how residential developments constitute sensitive end use. Consequently, they have advised on the inclusion of a contamination condition.

Barton Upon Humber Town Council: No objections.

PUBLICITY

The proposal has been advertised by means of site notice which was displayed on the 31/10/2024. This is in accordance with the LPAs statutory duty set out under article 15 of the Development Management Procedure Order 2015.

Comments Received: No comments received from the general public.

PLANNING HISTORY

[app_num] ↕	[proposal] ↕	[decision] ↕	[decision_date] ↕
7/1979/0657	To install new window.	Approve with Conditions	16/08/1979
7/1984/0398	Construct a new access.	Approve with Conditions	16/07/1984
PA/2024/1203	Planning permission to erect first floor and single storey rear extension including demolition of existing conservatory	-	-

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Site Description: The proposal is within the development limits of Barton Upon Humber. The site is in SFRA Flood Zone 2/3(a) Tidal land. The proposal is not within a conservation area. The property is located around 30m to the west of Listed Building, The Ropewalk.

The property is a two-storey detached dwelling located on Waterside Road, Barton Upon Humber. The front elevation of the property is in an eastern direction, with a front garden and parking provision positioned in front of this. To the rear, a conservatory (including a wc) currently extends 3.4m beyond the rear elevation of the dwellinghouse. Its width is 4.3m. A further outbuilding used for storage lines the rear wall of the property's curtilage. The rear garden exists for up to around 10m to the north of the conservatory and the outbuilding.

Proposal:

The first part of this proposal is to demolish the existing conservatory to the rear and to replace this with a single-story rear extension. The plans provide that the new rear extension would extend the same distance beyond the rear elevation of the property (3.4m). The width of proposed rear extension would be 7.7m, which is more than twice the width of the existing conservatory. It will be positioned up to the existing eastern elevation and around 1.5m from the western elevation. In terms of windows, there will be 4 large windows and bifold doors on the proposed rear elevation and one large window on the northern elevation. In terms of materials used in this section of the proposal, the walls will be made of red brick to match, the windows will be made of white UPVC and the roof will be made from EPDM (ethylene propylene diene terpolymer). The plans provide that the use of this portion of the extension will be residential; specifically, housing an open plan kitchen and snug.

The second part of this proposal is to erect a first-floor extension. This portion of the proposal would be located above the existing utility room, with the same dimensions. Specifically, the second part of the proposal would therefore extend around 4m from the existing rear elevation and 3.5m from the existing southern side elevation. The plans provide that one window will be located on the western (rear) elevation. The proposed roof will be flat, to match the existing rear portion of the property. In terms of materials used, the application form provides that the walls would be made from a matching white painted brick, the windows will be made from white UPVC to match and the roof will be made from EPDM. The plans provide that the use of this portion of the extension will be residential; specifically, an additional bedroom.

Principle of Development

Planning law indicates that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan in this case comprises of the policies of the North Lincolnshire Core Strategy (NLCS), the saved policies of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (NLLP) and the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD (HELADPD).

Policy CS3 from the NLCS provides that development limits will be defined in development plan documents. Outside these boundaries, development will be restricted to that which is essential to the functioning of the countryside. Conversely, it follows that land within these limits are deemed to have capacity for future development based on existing and proposed infrastructure, on its access to facilities and services and levels of public transport. The development limits are defined in the Housing and Employment Land Allocations Development Plan Document (HELADPD).

Policy DS5 from the NLLP outlines that planning applications for residential extensions and the erection of garages, outbuildings, walls and other structures will be allowed providing that the proposal does not unreasonably reduce sunlight, daylight, or result in overshadowing, overbearing or loss of privacy to adjacent dwellings. It further provides that proposals should also be sympathetic in design, scale and materials to the existing dwelling and its neighbours.

Assessment:

The proposal is located within the development limits of Barton Upon Humber. The principle is therefore supported by the development plan and policy CS3. Moreover, the proposal constitutes a residential extension and is therefore further supported in principle by policy DS5.

However, it should be noted that this 'in principle' position is subject to compliance with the technical and environmental issues and relevant policies outlined below, which constitute material considerations in the determination of planning applications.

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area:

Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy states that all new development in North Lincolnshire should be well designed and appropriate for their context. It also outlines how developments should contribute to creating a sense of place, with the policy stating that design which is inappropriate to the local area or fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of the area, not being acceptable.

Policy DS1 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that proposals are sympathetic in design, scale and materials to the existing dwelling and its neighbours and seeks that materials and finishes do not contrast markedly with those of the original building or neighboring properties.

Policy DS5 of the Local Plan provides design criteria for new residential extensions and the erection of garages, and generally seeks to ensure proposals are in keeping with their surroundings. It states that planning applications for residential extensions and the erection of garages, outbuildings, walls and other structures will be allowed provided that such proposals are sympathetic in design, scale and materials to the existing dwelling, and should not use materials or finishes which contrast markedly with those of the original building or neighbouring properties.

Policy SPG1 advises on the design on residential extensions. It provides that 'extensions to houses should be in keeping with the design of the original house in order to not appear as an "afterthought"'. It states that extensions should not dominate the building in terms of scale materials or situation.

Chapter 12 of the NPPF encourages that proposals should be well-designed and contribute to beautiful place-making. The NPPF goes on to say 'Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design'.

Assessment:

In terms of an assessment of the character of the area, it is noted that there is no uniform design or materials used within the street scene.

It is also noted that although the front elevation of the property is in view of the listed building, the whole of this proposal is located to the rear and as a result is screened

from view of the listed building. For the same reasons, the proposal would have no impact on the character of the area.

Regarding the impact on the original building itself, in terms of the materials used, the materials used for the walls and windows on both the rear extension and first floor extension are judged to be sympathetic to existing parts of the house to which they adjoin. Alternatively, the roof of both parts of the proposal will be made from EPDM. This is not present to date on the house however it is very similar to the bitumen felt currently used on the flat roof section of the existing property. These choices are therefore considered sympathetic and consequently, acceptable.

In terms of the scale of the rear extension, this represents a small increase in front print compared to the existing, with the existing conservatory making up half of the proposed area built upon. Furthermore, the rear extension will be of the same length to the existing conservatory. It is also noted that given rear extensions slightly smaller width than the original dwellinghouse, it appears subordinate in scale and consequently acceptable. The proposal will have little impact to the existing landform of the site, as the main section of the garden is located to the north of the extension. In terms of the scale of the first-floor extension, its length and width would align with the existing ground floor plan below and its height will align with the height of the section of the existing property to which it would adjoin. As a result of, this section of the proposal appears as it has always been part of the house. In summary, the scale of both parts of the proposal are acceptable.

In terms of an assessment of design, the only issue to note here is that two storey flat roofs are advised to be avoided in SPG1. However, it is relevant to note here that the portion of the existing property to which the first storey extension would adjoin also has a flat roof. Consequently, having considered this departure from the guidance document, which states its motivation is to avoid extensions which don't reconcile with the original building's design, this concern can be omitted. This conclusion is further compounded by how the flat roof is positioned to the rear of the property, out of view from the street and more, a pitched roof design may cause further amenity issues on the neighboring property to the south.

The Impact upon the Residential Amenity

Policy DS1 of the local plan states that no unacceptable loss of amenity to neighbouring land uses should result from new developments. Such impacts are designated to be related to noise, smell, fumes, dust or other nuisance, or through the effects of overlooking or overshadowing.

Policy DS5 of the Local Plan provides design criteria for residential extensions. It states that planning applications for residential extensions and the erection of garages, outbuildings, walls and other structures will be allowed providing that the proposal does not unreasonably reduce sunlight or daylight, or result in overshadowing, overbearing or loss of privacy to adjacent dwellings. It also states that development should not cause overshadowing as a result of the height and depth of the extension

blocking daylight and sunlight, particularly in the case of two storey extensions located on or close to the boundary.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (Section 12) indicates that planning policies and decisions should ensure that, amongst other requirements, developments create places which are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Supplementary Planning Document SPG1 for Residential Extensions outlines the depths and heights of residential extensions that are considered to not impact any undue loss of light to adjacent properties. Within this document the 45 degree test and the 30 degree test, which outline the maximum acceptable depths and heights, respectively, are described. It is important to note that both tests highlight that certain other factors, i.e. direction of the proposal, can mitigate this at the council's discretion.

Assessment:

It is relevant to note here that no comments of objection have been received from any neighbors.

It is also noted that as the floor plans outline that the new sections of the house will be used for residential purposes. It is therefore unlikely that any increased noise, smell, fumes, dust or other nuisance will come as a direct result of this development.

In terms of an assessment of properties likely to be impacted by this proposal in regard to loss of privacy or overbearing, overshadowing and loss of light, given that the rear extension will be screened by existing boundary treatments in the form of ~2m fencing, this portion of the proposal represents no further concerns.

In terms of the first storey extension, there are some concerns around loss of light imparted on the property immediately to south. Specifically, this relates to the window on the northern elevation of the neighboring property which is located around 1.5 to the south of the proposed first storey extension. However, following undertaking a site visit, it has been established that this window is not the main light source to the room, with a sky light and bifold doors to the rear providing more light. Additionally, as this window is north facing, the window will experience limited light throughout the duration of the day currently. In addition to this, it should be noted that the portion of the number 83 to which the proposal will adjoin has a very similar existing impact on blocking light compared to that produced by the proposal. As a result of this, the potential loss of light imparted on the neighbouring property is considered insufficient to warrant grounds or refusal.

Regarding loss of privacy, there are no new windows proposed on the southern elevation of the first storey extension. Alternatively, windows are located to the rear of the first storey extension, however there are no neighboring properties positioned in this direction which impacted by this. As a result, loss of privacy can be omitted from concern.

In summary, no impacts related to noise, smell, fumes, dust or other nuisance will

come as a result of this proposal as the use is the same: residential. Additionally, for the reasons stated above, overshadowing, overbearing, loss of light or loss of privacy to adjacent dwellings are also considered unlikely.

Flood Risk and Drainage:

Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy notes that the council will support development proposals that avoid areas of current or future flood risk, and which do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

Assessment:

The site is within SFRA Flood Zone 2/3 (a) Tidal. The LLFA Drainage team have considered the proposals and do not have any objections or comments. Therefore, it can be established that this proposal will not increase flood risk and as a result, satisfies policy CS19 of the NLCS.

Other matters:

Environmental Protection have noted that the proposal is located 250m from a historic landfill site. They have also noted that residential developments constitute a sensitive end use. As a result, they have recommended the inclusion of a condition relating to contamination be included.

Conclusion

In summary, the application for planning permission is acceptable in principle and is not considered to have any adverse impact on local character, residential amenity or flooding and drainage.

The proposal is considered to be compliant with policies CS3, CS5 and CS19 of the NLCS, DS1 and DS5 of the NLLP and chapter 12 of the NPPF. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION Grant permission subject to the following conditions:

1.
The development must be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason

To comply with section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.
The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/details:

Proposed Plan and Elevations 083-001

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

3. If during development any odorous, discoloured or otherwise visually contaminated material is found to be present at the site then no further development shall be carried out until a written method statement, detailing how this contamination shall be dealt with, has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The approved method statement shall be implemented in full prior to development commencing on the site.

Reason

To protect human health

Informative 1

In determining this application, the council, as local planning authority, has taken account of the guidance in paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework in order to seek to secure sustainable development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.