DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H13-1331-21**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs A Deamer**
Proposal:	Proposed change of use of building from Methodist Church to residential dwelling, together with internal and external alterations.		
Location:	Moulton Methodist Church Bell Lane Moulton		
Terminal Date:	2nd May 2022		

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
32	Community, Health and Well-being
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

NPPF 2021.

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
IAN MARSHMAN, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1
RESIDENTS	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

Proposed change of use of building from Methodist Church to residential dwelling, together with internal and external alterations.

The application has been revised since submission to alter the finish of the cladding to the single storey element of the scheme.

Site Description

The proposal site sits within the Moulton Conservation area along the prominent Bell Lane which is a primary route through the village. The Methodist Church is considered to be a Building of Local Heritage and therefore, concern is given to the preservation of the site as an example of Methodist Architecture, having believed to have been built in 1830.

The area immediately surrounding the site is largely residential containing a mix of architectural styles and periods. The building itself is within visual proximity to the grade II listed Manor House, and Number 2 Bell Lane.

History

H13-0228-20. Proposed change of use of building from Methodist Church (D1) to residential dwelling (C3). APPROVED 17-07-20.

Consultation Responses

Moulton Parish Council

Objection.

While I like the difference in materials used I do not think it suitable in the conservation area and there is no need to show the difference between original building and the new parts as the building is not listed.

Having looked at the plans for this the use of coloured composite panels on the new kitchen and entrance part is not in keeping with the current building and those around. Would be better to use brick so it blends in, therefore I am objecting to this application.

Having looked at these plans and knowing the area, the only problems I see are that there is NO garden to speak of and the spiral stair to the upper floor could be a FIRE risk to person/s using the upper bedroom with no escape! Should this be considered for future occupants?

Revised scheme

No response received regarding the amended scheme.

SHDC Building Control

There could be different ways to get this to comply with fire escape measures, the easiest being a window from the area large enough to get through.

LCC Historic Environment Officer

No archaeological input required.

Public

One resident contacted SHDC to seek further details of the proposal which were sent. No response was subsequently received.

Planning Considerations

The main issues in this case are:
Principle of Development
Layout and Design
Highway safety and parking
Impact of neighbouring Residents/land users
Flooding considerations
Foul and Surface Water Drainage
Heritage considerations

Principle of Development

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, states that the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The principle of the change of use of this building and the loss of a community asset were accepted by the grant of planning permission H13-0228-20, which is referenced above, which is still extant.

Layout and Design

Externally the proposal tries to emphasise the original building in its form and materials by altering the later extension so that it appears as a clear addition, something that is not at all clear at present and therefore detracts from the original structure. The roof will be removed, and a flat roof installed which will given a far better view of the north elevation of the original Methodist Church with its coloured glass windows, completely blocked currently by the large roof of the addition. The walls will be clad in off white, grey render and the openings will be altered to suit this more modern appearance, all the time creating am intentional clear contrast to the original building.

Internally it is intended to install a mezzanine first floor to create a master bedroom and en-suite. The ground floor area will be left open and used as a kitchen/living/dining space with a modern sculptural spiral staircase to create access to the new mezzanine. The later addition will be altered to create a second bedroom, a large entrance hallway with a small boiler/utility cupboard and the accessible W.C will be altered to create a shower room.

The detailing may need to be finessed to meet Building Regulations, however this wold not impact significantly on this proposal.

Highway safety and parking

The site on which the Methodist Chapel sits is very small, there is a small area of hardstanding to the front and to the south side and there is very little space to the north and west, a small access path around for maintenance only. The front will be fenced off from the public footpath and highway with a typical estate railing and the front will be formed into a small front garden with path and planting leading to the main access into the building. The hardstanding to the south will remain and be used for vehicle parking.

Impact of neighbouring Residents/land users

This scheme varies from the scheme approved under refence H13-0228-20 in that an upper mezzanine is being introduced. This would see the use of the existing two standard windows and a circular at first floor level being used for the bedroom and en-suite. These windows would look towards the front garden area of No.10 Bell Lane, and would be separated by the single storey addition. Due to the orientation of the buildings, very oblique views may be gained of the side elevation of No. 10. It is not considered that the residential amenity would be compromised to such an extent that consent would be refused on this basis.

The control of the single storey addition to preclude the use of the roof as a terrace is to be controlled via condition.

The Local Planning Authority does not consider there to be any risk presented to the residential amenity of any nearby properties in terms of overshadowing. This is because the external scale of

the proposal site is reducing, the proposal can include no further risk of overshadowing.

It is considered that the development accords with Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP in this regard.

Heritage considerations

Following revision, it is considered that all of the above will both improve the appearance of the Methodist Church by way of creating a clear separation between the original building and the later addition and also improve the setting of the Church within the Conservation Area of the village of Moulton by creating a more visually attractive view of the two prominent elevations of the building, notably the north elevation when entering the village and the east elevation when passing the building.

The proposal would enhance the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area and the views to and from nearby listed buildings.

It is considered that the development accords with Policy 29 of the SELLP in this regard.

PLANNING BALANCE

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, states that the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposal does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality, or amenity of nearby residents, and provides adequate parking. Taking into consideration these factors, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 29 and 36 and Appendix 6 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019, plus advice within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPFF), 2021.

The are no significant factors in this case that indicate against the proposal and outweigh factors in favour of the proposal and the policies referred to above.

Conclusion

Approve.

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.