

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	H16-0101-22	Applicant:	The Lighthouse Church
Proposal:	Demolition of rear hall and erection of two storey extension to incorporate ground and first floor halls, kitchen, food bank and function rooms.		
Location:	10 Haverfield Road Spalding		
Terminal Date:	10th June 2022		

Planning Policies**South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019**

02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
29	The Historic Environment

National Guidance**National Planning Policy Framework 2021**

Section 12- Achieving well designed places
Section 16- Achieving and enhancing the historic environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
IAN MARSHMAN, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	1	2
RESIDENTS	1	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a full planning application, seeking permission for the proposed demolition of rear hall and the erection of a two storey extension to incorporate ground and first floor halls, kitchen, food bank and function rooms to the Lighthouse Church at 10 Haverfield Road, Spalding.

Site Description

The site is situated within the defined settlement of Spalding, according to the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019), and is also within the Spalding Conservation area.

The building is built of red brick, with stone facings. The building was originally formed of a large hall and other smaller rooms to the internal layout which can be seen in the existing floorplan.

The site is slightly set back from the road, alongside the nursery to the west and the South Holland Council offices to the north of the site. The surrounding area is mostly characterised by a variety of service buildings such as a school, nursery and council offices, however, there are also residential two storey dwellings of a similar design along the east of Haverfield Road.

History

H16-0631-16- FULL- Approved on 07-11-16- Alterations to front door.

Consultation Responses

LCC Historic Environment Officer- It is recommended that the developer be required to submit a heritage impact assessment, produced using appropriate expertise where necessary, describing the significance of this non-designated heritage asset, how this will be impacted by the proposed development, and what measures will be taken to avoid or minimise any impact. It should meet the minimum requirements for development proposals affecting heritage assets set out in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Policy 29f and the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 194.

SHDC Environmental Protection (noise and odour) -
No objection.

SHDC Environmental Protection (contaminated land) -
No comments or objections with respect to land contamination.

Local Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority-
Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.

SHDC Conservation Officer-
Following the latest revisions of the submitted plans, I feel that the applicant has addressed the majority of my previous concerns and as such I wish to raise no further objection to the proposed extension of this Non-designated Heritage Asset. Conditions MD01 and MD02 should be applied to ensure that the materials used on the project are as fully appropriate to the conservation area setting as possible and closely matching to the existing materials.

Public comment-
- Concerns over increase in car parking
- Overlooking from proposed rear staircase
- The building lies in a conservation area and it would be a shame to demolish the rear section of the building and rebuild it again.

Planning Considerations

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2021 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting; and create

places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, among other considerations. Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP states that 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.

The proposed first floor extension will accommodate a new main hall to the first floor measuring approx. 22.9m by 17m. A new fire exit with a staircase will be formed from the first floor and will be situated on the rear elevation. The first floor extension covers the entire footprint of the existing ground floor. As well as the first floor extension, there is also a ground floor side extension extending out approx. 2.9m by 23m.

The new ground floor layout includes a food bank, kitchen, function room, offices and public toilets. To the first floor, there are minor alterations to the existing floor plan, to accommodate female and male public toilets, disable toilets, lift and a new office.

The proposed extension to the Lighthouse Church is considerable in terms of scale. The first floor extension would not include any windows, therefore there are significant areas of blank walling. Even though the church is not a listed building, it is considered to be a building with historic merit to the Spalding Conservation Area, and with the use of taxation windows to the exterior side elevations of the first floor, this is considered to add interest and further features to compliment with the existing structure.

The proposed materials include red brickwork, blue slate roof tiles, white timber windows and blue timber doors. All of the proposed materials are to match the existing materials.

Taking the above into account, the proposed first floor extension is considered to comply with Policies 2, 3 and 29 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2021 in terms of layout, design, size and scale.

Impacts upon Residential Amenity

There are no windows proposed to the first floor extension. There were public comments made about the external staircase in terms of concern regarding overlooking, however, the staircase is for fire escape purposes only and would not cause a material issue as this would only be used in case of an emergency. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would not have an adverse overlooking impact on adjacent dwellings.

The proposed extension is also not considered likely to be unduly overbearing or create overshadowing upon neighbouring properties to the north, west or east, due to the positioning of the site and the surrounding properties being situated a sufficient distance from the proposed extension. The closest dwelling is approx. 8m away to the east. However, it is situated on a very spacious plot and the separation distance is in excess of 12m. On the western and northern sides, the closest facing window to a residential dwelling is also at least 12m away.

Taking the above into account, the proposed extension is deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2021 in terms of residential amenity.

Highway Safety and Parking

There is very little in terms of on site parking, and therefore the Church is reliant more on people walking to site, local bus services, street parking and public car parks within the town centre.

There is clearly no potential for generating additional parking for this site and it exists in an area with a precedent of minimised parking provision, due to it being situated in a town centre location. It is impractical to suggest that such an application could be refused on parking provision grounds given its history and setting, with numerous public car parks within walking distance.

Planning Balance

It is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on this historic building and the surrounding environment in character and amenity terms. No adverse highway or parking impacts is anticipated. Therefore, the proposed development is considered to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in terms of the design and impact upon the historic environment which complies with policy 29 in the SELLP (2019).

Conclusion

The proposal is recommended for a delegated approval for the reasons stated above.

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 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 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.