

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	H16-0012-21	Applicant:	Centric New Homes Ltd.
Proposal:	Conversion of Existing 5 Bedroom Bungalow into 2no. Self Contained Flats		
Location:	2 Carrington Road Spalding		
Terminal Date:	3rd March 2021		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
04	Approach to Flood Risk
10	Meeting Assessed Housing Requirements
11	Distribution of New Housing
17	Providing a Mix of Housing
21	Houses in Multiple Occupation and the Sub-Division of Dwellings
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Sections 5, 12 & 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	1
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	1	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	1	0
RESIDENTS				

	2	0	0	3
--	---	---	---	---

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a full application for the conversion of an existing 5 bedroom bungalow into 2no. self contained flats at 2 Carrington Road, Spalding. Flat 2a to the front of the building would contain two bedrooms, a shower room, a store, and an open plan kitchen / dining / living area. Flat 2b to the rear of the building would contain two bedrooms, a store, a shower room, and an open plan kitchen / dining / living area. No extensions are planned to the building, although it is proposed to construct a pitched roof over the existing flat roof front extension. Window and door openings will be added and relocated, however, because the works would be for single storey flats there is not considered to be a material impact on the character and amenity of the surrounding area.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is within defined settlement limits and the surrounding area is characterised by dwellings of a similar age and varying design. The site is located in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 and is not subject to increased flood risk or flood depth on the 2115 0.1% South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping.

HISTORY

H16-1541-04

Full - Demolish existing bungalow and erect detached bungalow and two flats - Refused - 12 January 2005.

H16-0960-18 - To rear of the site

Full - Erection of bungalow, including the demolition of existing industrial premises - Refused - 26 November 2018 - Allowed on appeal - 23 August 2019. This scheme included the demolition of the front roof front extension to provide the bungalow with 2 off-street parking spaces and front garden. This would comply with policy as the smaller bungalow would have 3 bedrooms.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

LCC - County Highways & SUDS Officer

No objections. Requests standard utility and access informatives.

SHDC - Environmental Protection Officer

No objections.

Councillor Newton - Objects

"I believe our planning policy under SELLP indicates there should be at least 2 parking spaces for each unit. If they are not provided I could not support this application."
Increase in traffic and disturbance from additional on street parking.

Members of the public - 2 objections/3comments

- Lack of off road parking
- Increase in traffic and disturbance from additional on street parking.
- Impact on capacity of drains from increase in flats / HMOs on Carrington Road and adjacent

streets.

- Poor visibility at junction with Winsover Road due to amount of on street parking.
- Inconsiderate parking.
- Inconsiderate driving.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

The proposal is for residential development in the defined settlement limits of the largest settlement in the district. The principle of development is considered to be acceptable for this site.

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 Sub-Regional Centres. This section of the policy states:

"Within the settlement boundaries of Boston and Spalding (as shown on the Inset Maps) development will be permitted that supports their roles as Sub-Regional Centres."

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

The proposed would support Spalding's role as a Sub-Regional Centre by creating additional accommodation and demand for services.

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, layout and density is considered to be acceptable for the site. Trees to the front of the site are to removed to facilitate the provision of a parking space for Flat 2a. The character and appearance of the area will not be materially impacted by the proposal as the dwelling will not be materially extended or altered.
2. The design of the parking provision is cramped and amenity space is small for Flat 2a, and none is provided for Flat 2b. The orientation of the site cannot be altered as the bungalow is already in existence.
3. The proposed does not seek to maximise the use of sustainable materials as the bungalow is already in existence.
4. The proposal does not accord with the minimum requested parking provision of two parking places per dwelling / flat under Appendix 6. Additionally, the driveway to the side of the bungalow that would serve Flat 2b and the dwelling allowed on appeal under H16-0960-18 is only wide enough for one car and would create parking / manoeuvring difficulties for the occupants of both properties. The lack of off road parking provision would also have an impact on existing on road parking provision for Carrington Road, which is already suffering from a lack of off-road parking provision.

5. The proposal would not materially impact community services and infrastructure.

6. There is not considered to be a material noise or odour impact from the proposal. There is considered to be a material visual impact for the occupants of Flat 2a and Flat 2b due to the lack of outdoor amenity provision.

7. The site is located in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 and is not subject to increased flood risk or flood depth on the 2115 0.1% South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. There is not a need for any works to address flood risk matters and the sequential and exceptions tests do not need to be applied to conversions.

The proposal is not considered to accord with SELLP Policy 2 due to parking concerns.

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. A sense of place is not considered to be materially impacted by the proposal. The bungalow is not being materially changed, and the surrounding area does not have a defined built character. indeed the proposed pitched roof to the front extension would be considered to improve the appearance of the property.

9. The orientation of the bungalow cannot be altered to best enable decentralised and renewable low-carbon energy technologies.

11. There is not considered to be a material noise or odour impact from the proposal. There is considered to be a material visual impact for the occupants of Flat 2a and Flat 2b due to the lack of outdoor amenity provision.

12. The site is located in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3 and is not subject to increased flood risk or flood depth on the 2115 0.1% South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. There is not a need for any works to address flood risk matters and the sequential and exceptions tests do not need to be applied to conversions.

14. The proposal does not seek to incorporate any existing landscaping, and would require the removal of the frontage hedgerow and garden area to facilitate a single parking space to serve Flat 2a.

The proposal does not accord with SELLP Policy 3 due to parking and landscaping concerns.

Assessment against SELLP Policy 21 - Houses in Multiple Occupation and the Sub-Division of Dwellings

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 21 titled - Houses in Multiple Occupation and the Sub-Division of Dwellings. This policy states:

Proposals for the creation of large Houses in Multiple Occupation and the sub-division of dwellings will be permitted provided that, in each case:

1. it would not result in the loss of family-sized dwellings in high density residential streets of predominantly terraced and/or semi-detached properties;
2. it would not significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining or neighbouring properties by way of noise, overlooking, general disturbance or impact on visual amenity;
3. it would not have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, including the historic and natural environment;
4. adequate provision is made for the storage and disposal of refuse and recycling;
5. it would not have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding area by way of increased on-street parking, impaired highway safety or by impeding proper access to the area;
6. the site has good access - by walking and cycling - to community facilities, services, public transport and local employment;
7. an adequate standard of residential accommodation and residential amenity is provided for future occupiers; and
8. adequate provision is made for the communal gardens and amenity areas.

Where all of the above criteria are satisfied, the Nationally Described Space Standards (or any successor) will be applied to ensure that the occupiers have adequate floor space.

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

1. Carrington Road is not predominately terraced or semi-detached, with the split against detached dwellings being assessed at approximately 50%. Whilst 2 Carrington Road is a family sized dwelling, the proposal accords with this criterion.
2. The proposal would not harm the amenities of neighbours from overlooking or impact on visual amenity. It is also not considered that there would be a material impact on future occupiers and the dwelling approved to the rear under H16-0960-18 from noise and general disturbance due to the proximity of the driveway to Flat 2a and 2b. This is in light of the conclusion of the Inspector who considered the appeal to the rear of the site.
3. The proposal would not have an a noticeable impact on the character and appearance of the area as the bungalow is not being materially altered.
4. There is an acceptable level of room on site for the storage and disposal of refuse and recycling, as well as wheelie bins, if and when they are adopted by the district.
5. Each dwelling has two bedrooms and a single parking space. Therefore the proposal would likely lead to an increase in on-street parking, impaired highway safety through reduced visibility and increased traffic, and impeding proper access by Flat 2b and the dwelling approved under H16-0960-18 being served by a single vehicle width driveway.
6. The site has good access by walking and cycling to community facilities, services, public transport and local employment.

7. There is an adequate level of internal residential accommodation for future occupiers. However, there is considered to be an inadequate level of external residential amenity space due to noise, disturbance, lack of amenity space and the provision of only one off road parking space per flat.

8. Flat 2a has amenity space to the front that measures a maximum of 5 metres in length and 4 metres in width if no boundary treatment is provided. Flat 2b has no external amenity space taking into account the positioning of the proposed parking space.

The proposal does not accord with SELLP Policy 21.

Parking Standards

The following minimum standards should be used in accordance with Policy 36: Vehicle and Cycle Parking and Appendix 6.

Houses and Flats (C3a) -

Within the curtilage:

- 2 spaces for dwellings with up to 3 bedrooms
- 3 spaces for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms

A garage can count as one space if it is 2.6m x 5.6m internal width, with an additional 1m at the end to park cycles

Where it can be justified by the character and location of the site the standards may be relaxed for one bedroom dwellings, including flats, to one garage or parking space per unit and 1 additional space per 3 units for visitors.

Cycle Parking Standard:

1 space within each residential plot or 1 space per unit within a flatted development. Where it can be justified by the character and location of the site the standards may be relaxed.

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

Each flat has two bedrooms, therefore a minimum of two off-road parking spaces are required. The provisions of Appendix 6 of the Local Plan were highlighted to the agent and an amended block plan was received on 12 February 2021. However, this still only indicates a single parking space for each property.

The proposal does not therefore satisfactorily accord with Appendix 6 of the SELLP.

PLANNING BALANCE

Despite the fact that the application site is suitably situated in locational terms, due to the lack of off road-parking provision the proposal is not considered to accord with Policies 2, 3, 36 and Appendix 6 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. This is considered to be a fundamental issue and one which tips the planning balance not in favour of the proposal.

CONCLUSION

The proposal does not accord with local policy and is therefore recommended for refusal.

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.