

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	H17-0899-20	Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Wright
Proposal:	Erection of 5 bed detached dwelling		
Location:	Land Between 61-71 Seas End Road Surfleet		
Terminal Date:	7th December 2020		

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
29	The Historic Environment
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
 Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
 Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
IAN MARSHMAN - HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	1

WELLAND AND DEEPIINGS INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
---	---	---	---	---

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a full planning application for the erection of a 5 bed detached dwelling on land between 61-71 Seas End Road, Surfleet Seas End.

Site Description

The application site sits to the south-west of no. 71 Seas End Road and to the north-east of two new dwellings that have recently been completed. It is therefore effectively a small infill plot in between existing dwellings. The site fronts onto Seas End Road and backs onto the River Glen. Existing development in the vicinity is varied in terms of design and size. Plots 2 and 3 are modern in appearance (with brick and render and grey fenestration) whilst the adjacent dwelling to the north (no. 71) is a circa 1960/70s style dwelling.

History

H17-0379-20 - Reserved matters approval for the erection of detached dwelling (Plot 1) - outline approval H17-0636-17 (approved June 2020)

H17-0627-18 - Reserved matters approval for the erection of 2 detached dwellings - outline permission H17-0636-17 (approved August 2018)

H17-0636-17 - Outline application for residential development (re-submission of H17-0602-15) (approved September 2017)

H17-0602-15 - Outline application for residential development (approved on appeal July 2016)

Consultation Responses

Surfleet Parish Council - No comments.

LCC Highways/SUDS - No objections subject to highways informatives being added to the decision notice

LCC Historic Environment Officer - No objections to the submitted specification for archaeological monitoring. Requests that standard archaeological conditions 2 and 3 are imposed.

Welland and Deepings IDB - Advises the Applicant/Agent to consult the Environment Agency at an early stage due to the proximity to the River Glen.

Planning Considerations

The key considerations in this case are:

- Principle
- Layout, Scale and Appearance
- Highway Safety and Parking
- Residential Amenity
- Flood Risk and Drainage

Principle

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 site is located within the settlement boundary for Surfleet, as set out in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. Policy 1 (Spatial Strategy) of the SELLP indicates that within 'Minor Service Centres', such as Surfleet, "development will be permitted that supports their role as a service centre for the settlement itself, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities. Development will normally be limited to Allocated and Committed sites and infill". The proposal is for a single dwelling situated in between existing residential development. It can therefore be considered infill development. Additionally, incremental growth via infill development will help, albeit perhaps only to a small extent, sustain existing facilities. The site is therefore considered to be suitable in locational terms.

Furthermore, the site benefits from an extant reserved matters approval for a single dwelling meaning that the principle of residential development of the site has already been deemed acceptable.

Layout, Scale and Appearance

The proposal is for a 5 bedroom dwelling with a contemporary appearance. A similar palette of materials would be used as for the two new dwellings to the south-west (a combination of render, cream brick and slate appearance tiles). It would arguably be more visually in keeping with these properties than the most recent reserved matters approval relating to the plot as the skillion and lean to roof would be changed to a front gable and hipped roof. The three properties taken together are of similar scale and concept and the proposed dwelling would ensure the continuation of a coherent form of development.

The footprint of the dwelling would be slightly larger than that previously approved on the plot as the front elevation of the garage would project approx. 1.9m further forward than previously in order to accommodate a larger snug and utility room. The distance to the north-eastern boundary would be the same as previously approved and the distance to the south-western boundary would be 200mm greater. The distance to the river bank would be increased from 11.5m to 13.3m. The proposed dwelling would still sit comfortably within the plot and is acceptable in terms of size and scale.

Finished floor levels would have to be raised to 5.07m AOD to mitigate flood risk, which is 750mm above the carriageway level and around 500mm higher than existing average site levels. This is lower than the finished floor levels of the two recently constructed properties to the south-west but, given that the height of the existing dwelling to the north-east is lower still, raising levels to the extent proposed would not create a property out of keeping with the wider streetscene.

The ground floor layout is similar to that previously approved. At first floor, an additional bedroom with en-suite is proposed and an inner balcony. This is still in keeping with the residential use of the property.

Overall, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of layout, scale and appearance and therefore accords with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan. Policy 2 of the Local Plan requires development proposals to take into account sustainable development considerations such as: quality of design; and size, scale, layout, density, impact on character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development. Policy 3 requires development proposals to respect the density, scale and massing of neighbouring buildings and the landscape character of the location.

Highway Safety and Parking

The Highways Authority have not objected to the proposal and so it is considered acceptable in terms of highway safety. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy 2 of the Local Plan which requires it to be demonstrated that access and vehicle generation levels will be acceptable.

With regard to parking provision, Appendix 6 of the Local Plan sets out minimum parking standards for new developments. This sets out a requirement for 3 vehicle parking spaces (within the curtilage) for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms. The proposed arrangements are in accordance with this.

Residential Amenity

It is not considered that the proposed development would have a material adverse impact in terms of overlooking, loss of light/overshadowing or being overbearing.

As previously mentioned, the separation distance with the north-eastern boundary would remain the same as previously approved and the distance to the south-western boundary would be increased by 200mm. There are no significant changes proposed to fenestration on the north-eastern and north-western elevations. Three windows have been introduced on the south-western elevation but all would be obscure glazed. The south-eastern elevation faces towards the river. The maximum height would be the same as previously approved.

As previously highlighted, finished floor levels would have to be raised as a flood mitigation measure. In order to prevent overlooking at ground floor level, there is already 2.4m high fencing on the south-western boundary along the side of the dwelling. The north-eastern boundary is currently delineated by closeboard fencing which is around 1m in height. The applicant has agreed to a condition requiring the installation of higher fencing along that boundary in the interests of amenity.

The balcony at the rear would be enclosed at the sides and also partly at the front to prevent detrimental overlooking of the neighbouring garden.

Given the above, the latest proposal is considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity and in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan in this regard.

Flood Risk and Drainage

The NPPF requires the application of the Sequential Test to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. If, following the application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible, consistent with wider sustainability objectives, for the development to be located in zones with a lower probability of flooding, the Exceptions Test can be applied if appropriate.

The site is located within Environment Agency Flood Zone 1 and is therefore in a sequentially preferable location in flood risk terms.

The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (March 2017) (SFRA) shows predicted flood depths for the site of up to 0.25 metres. Finished floor levels are proposed to be set at 5.07m AOD which is approximately 500mm above average ground levels. This should therefore ensure that the development is safe for its lifetime.

In terms of drainage, the proposal is for surface water to be disposed of via soakaways and for foul water to be disposed of via mains sewer. There are no known permeability issues in this area that would preclude the use of soakaways.

Given the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2, 3, 4 and 30 of the Local Plan with regard to their provisions on flood risk, drainage and ground pollution.

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.

Conclusion

Taking the above into account, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with provisions contained within Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 30 and Appendix 6 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, as well as guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

The recommendation therefore is for a delegated approval.