

Development Management Delegated Decision Report

B/21/0041



SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION			
Application Reference	B/21/0041		
Application Type	Full Planning Permission		
Proposal	Demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of 4no. dwellings		
Location	Land to the rear of 11-13 High Street, Kirton, Boston PE20 1DR		
Applicant	Tim and Martin Jessop, Jessops the Bakers		
Agent	Paul Clarke, Framework		
Received Date:	01-Feb-2021	Consultation Expiry Date:	23-Mar-2021
Valid Date:	03-Feb-2021	Statutory Expiry Date:	31-Mar-2021
Date of Site Visit:	29-Mar-2021	Extension of Time Date:	30-Apr-2021
Objections received?	Yes		
5 day notification record:			
Councillors notified	Date	Response received – date	Ok to continue
David Brown	1.4.2021	None	Yes
Peter Watson	1.4.2021	2.4.2021	Yes
Nigel Welton	1.4.2021	1.4.2021	Yes
Recommendation	REFUSE Planning Permission		
Report by:	Simon Eldred		
Date:	19 th April 2021		

OFFICER REPORT

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site is located on the north-western side of High Street, Kirton and contains: a two-storey shop building fronting directly onto the pavement, with attached single-storey elements at its rear; a narrow tarmac-surfaced vehicular access, leading to a tarmac-surfaced yard; three substantial single-storey, linked outbuildings; and a grassed area within which trees have recently been removed.

The surrounding area is in a mixture of uses, and the site has: to its east, buildings in use as a bookmakers and a chiropodists (both of which appear also to have some residential use) and a warehouse; to its north, residential properties; to its west, a Community Centre; and to its south, the High Street, with on-street parking bays, and the War Memorial gardens.

The site is partly within the Kirton Conservation Area, and there are two listed structures to its south – a telephone kiosk and the War Memorial (both Grade II).



DETAILS OF PROPOSAL:

It is proposed to:

- demolish: the three outbuildings; and two single-storey elements which are attached to the rear elevation of the shop building;
- erect a terrace of four two-storey dwellings. The terrace will measure approximately 20.6m x 11m in plan, and will stand approximately 8.5m in height (5.2m at eaves level). The dwellings will each have a living room, kitchen/dining room, entrance hall, and WC on the ground-floor and three bedrooms and a bathroom on the first-floor. Each dwelling will have a ground and first-floor window in its front elevation, ground-floor french-doors and two first-floor windows in its rear elevation, and the two end properties will each have a first-floor window in their side elevations, serving their bathrooms.

To their rear, each dwelling will have grassed garden containing a single tree, with the gardens separated from one another by 1.8m-high close-boarded fences, and pedestrian access will be available to the two central gardens via a passageway. To their front, each dwelling will have a small gravel-surfaced area and planting bed and, beyond a footpath, a hard-surfaced courtyard providing twelve car parking spaces and sufficient manoeuvring space to enable vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward gear.

Vehicular and pedestrian access onto the public highway will be provided between the buildings, 13 and 15 High Street. This access will have a width of approximately 2.6m-3m and a length of approximately 9m, and will require vehicles to cross the pavement on the western side of High Street before joining the carriageway.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

B/01/0399 – full planning permission was granted for the construction of a garage and store.

B/01/0400 – Conservation Area Consent was granted for the demolition of a steel-clad shed.

RELEVANT DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES AND DOCUMENTS:

The **South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036** shows the site as being within Kirton's Settlement Boundary, and partially within: the Conservation Area; the Town Centre Boundary; and the Primary Shopping Area. The relevant policies of the Local Plan are:

- Policy 1: Spatial Strategy;
- Policy 2: Development Management;
- Policy 3: Design of New Development;
- Policy 4: Approach to Flood Risk;
- Policy 28: The Natural Environment;
- Policy 29: The Historic Environment;
- Policy 30: Pollution;
- Policy 31: Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy; and
- Policy 36: Vehicle and Cycle Parking.

OTHER RELEVANT DOCUMENTS / LEGISLATION / GUIDANCE:

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

At the heart of the 2019 Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The following sections are relevant to this scheme:

- Section 4: Decision-making;
- Section 5: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes;
- Section 9: Promoting sustainable transport;
- Section 11: making effective use of land;
- Section 12: Achieving well-designed places;
- Section 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change;
- Section 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment; and
- Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Boston Borough Council's Environmental Health department indicates that it has no objections but asks that:

- conditions should be attached to require a phased contaminated land assessment to ensure that the land quality is suitable or what steps are required to remediate it suitable for use;
- electric vehicle recharging points should be provided;
- the applicant should provide a construction environmental management plan to minimise adverse impacts on residential neighbours. The plan should include as a minimum: details of measures to minimise and control noise, vibration, dust and fumes during development; traffic management; the location and storage of plant and materials; measures to prevent the spread of mud onto the public highway; hours of operation/site deliveries; and site security.

Kirton Parish Council objects on the basis that:

- the vehicular access is straight onto the footpath with no clear view of pedestrians;
- the footpath will be obstructed by bins;
- the development is not in keeping with the Conservation Area;
- the proposal is over-development of the site;
- on-street parking spaces intended for shoppers will be used by occupants of the proposed dwellings;
- the vehicular access is too narrow to accommodate emergency vehicles.

The Parish Council asks that the application should be called-in to the Planning Committee, if the planning officer is minded to approve.

Lincolnshire County Council (the Local Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority) indicates that:

- sufficient parking provision has been made;
- the proposal will allow vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear;
- the access arrangements are considered to be acceptable and the proposal will not result in an unacceptable impact upon highway safety (taking account of: the fact that it is an existing access; the frequency of vehicle movements; the amount of pedestrian activity; the width of the footway; the lack of personal injury accidents in the vicinity in the last five years; and the width of the access); and

- consideration should be given to a secure cycle storage area.

As a consequence it concludes that the proposed development is acceptable and accordingly does not wish to object.

Heritage Lincolnshire identifies that the site is: immediately adjacent to the Kirton Conservation Area; and relatively well-screened but retains a character of ancillary out-buildings. It goes on to indicate that:

- proposals must retain this character and not compete with the principal frontage building;
- the buildings proposed to be demolished make little contribution to the area's character;
- the proposals are supported, provided conditions are placed upon any approval to secure the use of high-quality, traditional materials in the buildings and the courtyard's surface.

THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

A resident of Anton's Gowt asks for the installation of a minimum of five swift nest bricks in the buildings to provide biodiversity enhancements.

Six local residents have objected. Their concerns can be summarised as:

- the vehicular access (which is narrow, has poor visibility, cannot accommodate emergency vehicles, and crosses a busy pavement) is unsuitable and the development will have unacceptable impacts upon highway safety. Evidence concerning past accident numbers is irrelevant given that, over that period, the access was in very light use;
- the intensification of the use of the existing vehicular access will cause damage to neighbouring buildings;
- the proposal will have unacceptable adverse impacts upon neighbouring dwellings (Burrells and 9A High Street) by: overshadowing/loss of light; increased noise and disturbance; and overlooking/loss of privacy from proposed first-floor windows; and
- existing problems with the local drainage system will be exacerbated by the development.

EVALUATION:

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that determination must be made in accordance with the Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The key considerations in regard to this application are:

- matters of principle;
- impacts on the character and appearance of the area and on heritage assets;
- impacts on neighbours' amenity;
- flood risk;
- biodiversity;
- potential contamination risks;
- water use issues;
- air quality issues;
- highway safety;
- parking provision; and
- other matters raised by objectors.

Principle

Policy 1 of the Local Plan identifies that, within Kirton's Settlement Boundary, development will be permitted that supports its role as a service centre for the settlement itself, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities. It is considered that a proposal to redevelop land to the rear of a retail unit to provide additional dwellings meets these requirements of Policy 1.

Impact on the character of the area and on heritage assets

Policy 2 of the Local Plan indicates that development will be permitted which will not have harmful impacts upon the character and appearance of the area.

Policy 29 of the Local Plan seeks the conservation and enhancement of the area's historic environment.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 confirms the duty of a local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving conservation areas and the settings of listed buildings. In the context of Sections 66 and 72 of the Act, the objective of preservation is to cause no harm. The courts have said that this statutory requirement acts as a paramount consideration – 'the first consideration for a decision maker'. Planning decisions require balanced judgement but, in that exercise, significant weight must be given to the objective of heritage conservation.

In practice, this requires a methodical approach to be followed, whereby the relevant assets that would be affected are identified, along with their significance. Consideration can then be given to any effects on this significance resulting from the proposals, which may be reduced through mitigation. If harm is identified, it is then required to establish the scale and extent of such harm, before moving on to matters such as the planning balance and weighing the public benefits arising against any identified harm.

Heritage assets affected – It is considered that a number of heritage assets could potentially be affected. Firstly, the application site is located partly within the Kirton Conservation Area. Secondly, there are a number of listed buildings in the vicinity. Of these, it is considered that the development has the potential to affect the settings only of the War Memorial and telephone kiosk (both Grade II) which are located 25m-30m to the south-east of the site.

Impacts of the proposals on these assets – As a consequence of their relatively hidden location, the extensions and outbuildings which are proposed to be demolished contribute very little to the Conservation Area's character or to the settings of nearby listed buildings. Furthermore, given their materials and design, that contribution is not strongly positive. It is therefore considered that their removal will have no adverse impacts upon any nearby heritage assets.

The visual character of the proposed terrace will be very different to that of the outbuildings, and there is a risk that the proposals might compete visually with the frontage shop building, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area generally and the Conservation Area, and the settings of the listed structures. However (and notwithstanding the Parish Council's objection that the proposal is not in keeping with the Conservation Area):

- the narrow access-way means that views of the proposed terrace from High Street will be very limited; and

- the design of the terrace's front elevation is attractive, and contains feature-brickwork and window details that contribute to a traditional character that will not appear out-of-place in the village's historic core.

Nonetheless, it is considered that the scheme will be visually successful only if high-quality, traditional materials are used for the terrace' external surfaces and the courtyard's surface, and these matters can be controlled by condition.

The Parish Council also argues that the proposal amounts to 'over-development' of the site, which it is assumed is concern about the scheme's density. Whilst it is true that the proposal seeks the 0.13 hectare site to accommodate 4 dwellings and a shop building, it is not considered that the scale or type of homes proposed will be out-of-character when compared to existing nearby dwellings. Nor is it considered that unsatisfactorily small plots or inadequate parking/manoeuvring space (see below) are proposed.

In all (and subject to a condition to require the approval of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the dwellings and the courtyard), it is considered that the proposal will not adversely affect: the character and appearance of the area; the character and appearance of the Kirton Conservation Area; or the settings of nearby listed structures – a view shared by Lincolnshire Heritage. It is therefore considered that the proposal meets the requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and Policies 2 and 29 of the Local Plan.

Neighbours' amenity

Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan require the amenity of neighbouring land users to be protected. Objections have been received concerning potential impacts upon the amenity of neighbouring dwellings, Burrells and 9A High Street.

Boston Borough Council's Environmental Health department asked that the applicant should provide a construction environmental management plan to minimise adverse impacts on residential neighbours. The applicant indicated that they would be content for this requirement to be conditioned, and it is considered that an appropriate condition could satisfactorily deal with this matter.

The application site has a Community Centre to its west, and retail and restaurant premises to its south, and it is considered that the proposal will have no adverse impacts upon the amenity of these neighbouring land users. However, there are dwellings to the site's north and east, and impacts upon these neighbouring land users require more detailed consideration.

To the site's north-west is a terrace of two-storey dwellings, 1-5 Penny Gardens. These dwellings are located more than 35m from the proposed terrace and, at this distance, it is considered that the proposals will have no adverse impacts in terms of over-shadowing or loss of light. Although 1-5 Penny Gardens have windows in their eastern elevation, (towards which windows in the proposed terrace's rear elevation will look) it is considered that the separation distances will ensure that there are no significant adverse effects in terms of harm to outlook or overlooking/loss of privacy.

To the site's north-east is a single-storey dwelling, Burrells whose occupant has objected to the proposals on the basis that they will impact upon their amenity in terms of loss of light and loss of privacy. The closest of the existing outbuildings is located within approximately 14m of the bungalow and 0.75cm of its garden, presenting a blank gable end towards the dwelling

with an estimated height of 4.75m at ridge level and 2.8m at eaves level. The proposed terrace will:

- be significantly closer to the bungalow (approximately 9.5m);
- be significantly taller (approximately 8.5m at ridge level and 5.2m at the eaves); and
- have windows at first-floor level in its rear elevation which will provide uninterrupted (albeit slightly oblique) views towards Burrells; although
- it will be located slightly further from the common boundary (approximately 1.9m).

Given the orientation of the terrace, it is noted the proposed terrace, particularly the side/rear of the end property will affect Burrells' sunlight, daylight to the property and would introduce the presence of a two storey massing close to the property and rear garden. It is considered that, given the southerly position of the proposed building to Burrells, it will have an unacceptable severe impact upon the availability of light to Burrells and its garden. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposal will have unacceptable impacts upon the privacy of the living-room window in Burrell's rear elevation, which currently suffers no overlooking from nearby windows. Although the boundary is defined by a 2m-high close-boarded fence which will obscure views from the ground-floor french-doors in the terrace's rear elevation, it will not obscure views from the first-floor windows, and there are no other features or planting that will mitigate such views.

To the site's south-east is 9/9A High Street which accommodates a bookmakers shop and dwelling. The occupant of the dwelling has objected to the proposals on the basis that they will impact upon their privacy, and undermine the amenity of their garden through increased pollution and noise. The proposed terrace will be 22m from the rear elevation of 9A High Street and it is considered that, at this distance, the proposals will have no significant adverse impacts on the dwelling in terms of over-shadowing/loss of light, harm to outlook or overlooking/loss of privacy. The courtyard at the front of the terrace (which will be used for car parking/manoeuvring) will be located immediately adjacent to the dwelling's rear garden – separated from it by a 1.5m-high brick wall. It is considered that impacts from this use of the courtyard are unlikely to be unacceptably severe, and would be little or no worse than the reinstatement of the yard's previous commercial use.

Although it is considered that the proposals will not have unacceptably severe impacts upon the amenity of most neighbouring land users, it is nonetheless considered that they will have unacceptable impacts upon the privacy of the living-room window in Burrell's rear elevation, which currently suffers no overlooking from nearby windows. These impacts mean that the proposals do not meet these requirements of Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan, and this weighs against them

Flood risk

Policy 4 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that new development is not unnecessarily exposed to flood risk, and does not increase flood risk elsewhere.

The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which identifies potential sources of flooding, and that (even allowing for climate change impacts up to 2115) the site is not within a Hazard rating area. The FRA therefore concludes that the residual risk of flooding is not significant, but that:

- the Finished Floor Levels of the dwellings should be set at 300mm above ground level (i.e. at 4.3m AOD); and

- flood resilience measures should be incorporated into the dwellings' construction.

It is considered that, subject to a condition to require the implementation of the flood mitigation measures identified in the sections entitled 'Flood Resilience Construction' and 'Conclusion' of the FRA, the proposals meet the requirements of Policy 4.

Biodiversity

Policy 3 requires the incorporation of existing hedgerows and trees into development proposals, and the provision of appropriate new landscaping to enhance biodiversity.

Policy 28 requires all development proposals to provide an overall net gain in biodiversity.

Policy 31 requires all development proposals to incorporate measures which promote and enhance green infrastructure and provide a net gain in biodiversity.

A respondent asked for the installation of a minimum of five swift nest bricks in the buildings.

The majority of the application site is currently tarmac-surfaced or contains well-maintained buildings, which show no signs of providing nesting or roosting sites. It contains no trees or shrubs, although western parts are under grass and it is evident that a number of trees have recently been felled. It therefore contains no meaningful features of biodiversity value which could be incorporated into the development.

The proposals include the planting of: four new trees in the dwellings' rear gardens (two wild cherries and two rowans); two areas of shrub planting (viburnum, hebe, potentilla, escallonia, and lavandula); and grassed rear gardens. A sparrow terrace box, a bat box, and a swift box are also proposed to be built into the rear and side elevations of the dwellings.

It is considered that the above measures will enhance the nesting and foraging opportunities offered by the site, and will ensure that the proposals will provide an overall net gain in biodiversity and meet these requirements of Policies 3, 28 and 31.

Contamination

Policy 30 indicates that development proposals on contaminated land (or where there is reason to suspect contamination) must include an assessment of the extent of contamination and any possible risks.

Although the application site is not formally identified as having suffered historical contamination, former uses of the site may have created ground contamination. The Borough Council's Environmental Health department has asked that *"conditions relating to a phased contaminated land assessment are attached to any consent to ensure the land quality is suitable or what steps are required to remediate it suitable for use."* In these circumstances, it is considered appropriate for conditions to be applied to require the investigation and remediation of any such risks.

It is considered that, subject to these conditions, the proposals meet these requirements of Policy 30.

Water use issues

Policy 3 requires development proposals to minimise the use of water, and Policy 31 specifically requires residential development to comply with the Building Regulation water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day.

The application and accompanying documents do not address issues concerning water use. However, it is considered that this matter can be adequately dealt with by the attachment of a condition to require the water consumption of each dwelling to not exceed 110 litres per person per day.

It is considered that, subject to this condition, the proposals meet these requirements of Policies 3 and 31.

Air quality issues

Policy 30 requires development proposals to include suitable measures to mitigate any adverse impacts on air quality and, to this end, the Borough Council's Environmental Health department has requested that electric vehicle recharging points should be provided.

Drawing Number J2018 121 Rev A shows the provision of a 'Mode 2 electrical vehicle charging point' on the external wall adjacent to the front entrance of each dwelling. It is considered that these provisions satisfactorily meet the requirements of Policies 3 and 31 in respect of air quality issues.

Highway safety

Policy 2 identifies vehicular access as a sustainable development consideration, and objections from the Parish Council and local residents have been received on the basis that the proposed access arrangements will be unsafe. The particular concerns which have been expressed are that:

- the access is too narrow to accommodate emergency vehicles;
- the access is too narrow to safely carry the traffic that will be generated by the development;
- vehicles leaving the site will have no clear view of pedestrians as they begin to cross the pavement, which carries large numbers of pedestrians including children; and
- there is the potential for confusion between drivers entering or leaving the site and drivers manoeuvring into or out of the parking bays on High Street.

The Highway Authority has provided very full comments, indicating that the proposal includes *"turning facility within the site to allow vehicles to enter and leave in a forward gear. The Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority have been mindful of the fact that this is already an existing access and is suitable, so that drivers intending entering the highway at this access may have sufficient visibility of approaching traffic and pedestrians to judge if it is safe to make the manoeuvre. Vehicles exiting at the back edge of the footpath from this access will have to take account of pedestrians on the footway. The absence of wide visibility splays at this access will encourage drivers to emerge more cautiously and consideration has been given to whether this is appropriate, taking account of the frequency of vehicle movements, the amount of pedestrian activity and the width of the existing footway. Although the existing access is narrow, there is sufficient visibility and room for vehicles to enter and leave without causing queueing or obstruction should they meet other vehicles at the access. Additionally, there has*

been no recorded Personal Injury Accidents (PIA) in the vicinity of this access in the last five years. It is therefore not considered that this proposal would result in an unacceptable impact upon highway safety."

The views expressed by the Highway Authority are thorough and unequivocal, and it is agreed that there is no evidence to support concerns that the proposals would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Whilst it may be the case that larger vehicles used by the emergency services would be unable to negotiate the access-way, the distance between the edge of the pavement and the front elevations of the proposed dwellings will be approximately 30m – a distance that should not cause unacceptable problems.

Notwithstanding the objections, it is considered that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, and that they therefore meet these requirements of Policy 2.

Parking provision

Policy 36 indicates that all new development should provide vehicle and cycle parking in accordance with minimum standards set out in Appendix 6. The Appendix indicates that 2 car parking spaces and 1 cycle parking spaces should be provided within the curtilage of each dwelling with up to three bedrooms.

The proposed development includes four 3-bed dwellings, and the above standards therefore require the provision of 8 car parking spaces and 4 cycle parking spaces. The proposal comfortably exceeds the car parking requirements, providing a total of 12 car parking spaces, and this is acknowledged in the Highway Authority's comments. Given the significant on-site provision for parking, it is considered unlikely that the dwellings' residents would seek to use the on-street parking spaces in front of the shop building as feared by the Parish Council.

However, the proposal includes no specific cycle parking provision and the Highway Authority indicates that *"consideration should be made to a secure cycle storage area."* Notwithstanding the Highway Authority's comments, such provision is considered unnecessary, given that each dwelling is provided with a rear garden within which cycles could be securely stored.

Notwithstanding the Parish Council's objection and the Highway Authority's comments, it is considered that the proposals make adequate provision for the parking of cars and bicycles, and that they therefore meet the requirements of Policy 36.

Other matters raised by objectors

Kirton Parish Council objects to the proposals on the basis that bins will be stored/put on the footpath which would cause an obstruction. It is considered that the proposal makes adequate provision for bin storage in the dwellings' rear gardens (given that pedestrian access to all the proposed rear gardens can be achieved without the need to pass through the dwellings). It is therefore considered highly unlikely that any occupant would seek to store their bin(s) on the pavement, 30m distant from their home. The temporary placing of bins on the pavement for emptying is considered unlikely to create adverse effects.

A local resident objects to the proposals on the basis that they have existing problems with the drainage system which will be exacerbated by an increase in the number of dwellings locally. Anglian Water Services Ltd. was consulted on the application, but raised no concerns.

Two local residents object on the basis that the intensification of the use of the access will harm neighbouring buildings. Whilst it is accepted that the access is narrow, it is considered that no specific evidence has been put forward to suggest that its use by the vehicles associated with four dwellings (rather than the vehicles associated with a bakery business) would have significant adverse impacts upon the integrity of nearby buildings.

CONCLUSION:

The proposals will:

- subject to a condition, have no significant adverse effects upon the character and appearance of the area, the character and appearance of the Kirton Conservation Area, or the settings of nearby listed structures;
- subject to a condition, be acceptable in flood risk terms;
- provide an overall net gain in biodiversity;
- subject to conditions, be acceptable in terms of possible existing land contamination;
- subject to a condition, minimise the use of water;
- acceptably mitigate any potential adverse impacts upon air quality;
- not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety;
- make adequate provision for the parking of cars and bicycles; and
- meet the requirements of the relevant Policies of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036.

However, the proposals do not accord with the Local Plan's requirements in terms of impacts upon neighbours' amenity as set out in Policies 2 and 3. They will have adverse impacts upon the level of light and privacy of the living-room window in the rear elevation of the dwelling to the site's north-east (Burrells), which currently suffers no overlooking from nearby windows or overshadowing from buildings. Furthermore, given the presence of the end terrace to the neighbouring property there would be an increased sense of massing of the two storey building close to the boundary which would overshadow and close up the open aspect of the garden space immediately to the rear of the property. It is considered that these impacts will be sufficiently severe to mean that it is appropriate for planning permission to be refused.

RECOMMENDATION:

REFUSE Planning Permission for the following reason:-

CONDITIONS / REASONS	
Pre-commencement conditions?	Agreed with applicant/agent - Date:
1	The proposed development, by virtue of the height, massing and proximity to the dwelling immediately to the north-east (Burrells) and the inclusion of first-floor windows in their rear elevation will result in an inappropriate and un-neighbourly form of development which will have unacceptable impacts upon Burrells in terms of loss of privacy, loss of light and introducing significant massing in close proximity to the property's habitable room window and immediate garden space. As a consequence, the proposed development would significantly harm residential amenity and as such is contrary to the provisions of Policies 2, 3 and 30 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036.

INFORMATIVES / NOTES TO BE INCLUDED ON/WITH DECISION NOTICE
--

<u>STATEMENT OF PROACTIVE WORKING:</u>
--

In determining this application, the authority has taken account of the guidance in paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 in order to seek to secure sustainable development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the Borough.
--

The application has been considered against the following plans and documents:
--

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• J2018 100 Rev A Site Location Plan• J2018 121 Rev A Proposed Site Plan• J2018 00150 Rev A Proposed Plans and Elevations• J2018 00151 Proposed Front Elevation• J2018 00152 Existing and Proposed Rear Elevation• J2018 104 Coloured Site Plan• J2018 105 Design Strategy• J2018 122 Proposed Demolition Plan• J2018 123 Proposed Block Plan• Design and Access Statement Dated January 2021• Flood Risk Assessment Dated October 2020 V1• Heritage Impact Assessment Dated January 2021• Covering Letter to include Structural Survey and Utilities Statement |
|---|