DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H16-1052-20**	**Applicant:**	**Spalding Academy**
Proposal:	Proposed single storey PE changing room block		
Location:	Spalding Academy School Neville Avenue Spalding		
Terminal Date:	18th January 2021		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019	
01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

12 - Achieving well-designed places.

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a full planning application for a proposed single storey PE changing room block at Spalding Academy School, Neville Avenue, Spalding. The proposal seeks to provide 2 changing rooms, 2 offices, 2 laundry rooms,2 disable wc / showerrooms, and four wc rooms. The building will measure 28 metres in length and 12.7 metres in length, with a 2.6 metre eaves height and 6.6 maximum apex height. The external materials will be red brick with Marley Thrutone Blue Slates and white UPVC windows. Exact brick materials would be secured by condition.

SITE DESCRIPTION

There are school buildings to the north beyond an grassed mound and to the east. The games court is to the west and playing fields are to the south. The proposal site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 3, and in a "Danger for All" hazard, with a maximum predicted flood depth of over 2 metres. Finished floor levels will not be sited any lower than that of the existing building which is the recommendation for all non-residential dwellings.

RELEVANT HISTORY

None

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

LCC - County Highways & SUDS Officer

No objection - "The development will not result in an increase in staff or pupil numbers. The access and parking arrangements remain unchanged, therefore, it is considered that the proposals would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. As Lead Local Flood, Lincolnshire Council Council is required to provide a statutory planning consultation response with regard to drainage on all Major Applications. This application is classified as a Minor Application and it is therefore the duty of the Local Planning Authority to consider the drainage proposals for this planning application."

SHDC - Environmental Protection Officer

No objections.

South Holland Internal Drainage Board

No objections - Provides general drainage advice.

Member of the public

Disturbance during construction through use of an access onto Matmore Gate.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

The proposed extension is for educational purposes within the central area of the school campus. The principle of development in this location is considered to be acceptable.

Impact on Matmore Gate

Disturbance during construction is not a material planning concern. Access via Matmore Gate is considered to cause less disturbance than accessing the school through Neville Avenue, then manoeuvring vehicles around to the rear of the school site.

Compliance with 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 criteria the following can be observed:

1. The size, scale and layout is subservient in scale to that of the surrounding buildings. No trees will be impacted by this proposal. The character and appearance is unaltered as the development is not visible to the public outside of the boundaries of the application site.

2. The design is considered to be broadly in keeping with the character of the building and the removal of the asbestos roofing is welcomed by the Local Planning Authority. The orientation is in keeping with the character of the existing buildings in the vicinity.

3. The use of sustainable materials has not been maximised, however, the proposed materials are in keeping with nearby buildings.

4. The proposal is not considered to impact access and vehicle generation levels.

5. The capacity of existing community services and infrastructure is not impacted by this proposal.

6. There is not considered to be a noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion impact on neighbouring school buildings or the wider area.

7. There is not a material impact on sustainable drainage or flood risk as a result of this extension. South Holland Internal Drainage Board has stated that a surface water discharge application for land drainage consent must be made to the Board.

8. Natural habitats, historical buildings and heritage assets are not impacted by this proposal.

9. Sand and gravel mineral resources are not impacted by this proposal.

When assessed against the above, the proposal is considered to accord with SELLP Policy 2.

Compliance with 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 criteria the following can be observed:

1. The purpose of the proposal is not to create a sense of place, however, the design is in keeping with that of the nearby buildings.

2. The proposal is within the grounds of a school so public space is unaffected.

3. The landscape character of the location is underutilised grass land. There is not considered to be a detrimental impact from this proposal.

4. The school is frequently accessed on foot, bicycle and public transport. This proposal has no impact on the choice of transport options available to site users.

5. The layout of recycling bins, storage, bicycle parking and car parking is not impacted by this proposal.

6. The lighting of public spaces is not impacted by this proposal.

7. The accessibility of public spaces is not impacted by this proposal.

8. Crime prevention and community safety is not impacted by this proposal.

9. The orientation of buildings is not prioritised to maximise the use of low carbon technology.

10. Facades, advertisements and signage are not impacted by this proposal.

11. The proposal is not visible to the public and will not lead to an increase in site movements. Residential amenity is not impacted by this proposal.

12. There is not a material impact on sustainable drainage or flood risk as a result of this extension. South Holland Internal Drainage Board has stated that a surface water discharge application for land drainage consent must be made to the Board.

13. Local materials are not to be utilised. Water take and soil quality is not materially impacted by this proposal.

14. Landscaping is not impacted by this proposal.

15. Historic buildings are not impacted by this proposal.

PLANNING BALANCE

The proposal provides much needed changing room provision without impacting the amenity of site users, neighbours, or the character of the surrounding area.

In light of the above considerations the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

CONCLUSION

A delegated approval is considered to be appropriate.

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.