

Justification Statement



Site: Adjacent 'Fairview', Birds Drove, Surfleet, Lincs, PE11 4BE

Applicant: Mr R.A Brown

Prepared by: Richard Brown Dip. Est Man

Richard Brown (Estate Management) Ltd

Checked by: Trevor Clay RIBA

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
PLANNING POLICY & PLANNING HISTORY.....	1
LOCAL PLAN.....	1
PLANNING HISTORY.....	1
LOCAL PLANNING PRECEDENTS.....	1
NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY.....	2
SECTION 13.....	2
LOCAL PLANNING POLICY.....	2
Policy 1.....	2
Policy 2.....	3
Policy 3.....	4
Policy 22.....	5
FALL BACK POSITION.....	6
DESIGN.....	6
MATERIALS.....	6
BUILDING FOOTPRINT.....	6
DESIGN AND MASSING.....	7
U-VALUES & AIRTIGHTNESS.....	7
CONCLUSION.....	8
APPENDICES.....	9

INTRODUCTION

TAC Architects has been appointed by Richard Brown (Estate Management) Ltd to submit a planning application on a parcel of land which currently had planning permission to convert an existing barn, now mainly demolished. This document provides a rationale for justifying a new build dwelling in keeping with the neighbouring properties and adjacent new build.

The dwelling proposes to be an improvement on the existing barn and allow for the site to be utilised and the construction to allow for a more sustainable and environmentally conscious building on the site.

The relevant policies of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (SELLP) have been highlighted and justification is provided to demonstrate how the proposal meets them and therefore should be recommended for approval.

PLANNING POLICY & PLANNING HISTORY

LOCAL PLAN

The site is in the administrative district of South Holland and planning policy for the area as dictated by the adopted development plan, the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (SELLP).

PLANNING HISTORY

There is one recent planning application that is relevant to the site, it is as follows:

- H17-0531-21 Conversion of agricultural and nursery building to residential dwelling.

The above application was approved and resulted in a permission for one dwelling on site. This Full Planning Permission should be treated as an existing dwelling for this purpose of this application (although part retrospective).

LOCAL PLANNING PRECEDENTS

Two recent permissions as gained within the district which holds many similarities to the application site and proposal.

- H08-0443-22 Erection of dwelling and H08-0861-21 conversion of agricultural building into dwelling.
- H13-1269-21 Demolition of agricultural building and erection of detached dwelling

The above applications were approved and due to the similarities listed below, the application site should be looked upon favourably also.

Both sites are for the replacement of a dwelling which gained permission through class Q permitted development but have not been built out, therefore the permission is regarded as the existing dwelling.

Both proposals also sought to increase the dwelling size from that which gained permission through class Q.

This increase of roughly 50% has been applied to the proposal. As a result this precedent shows an increase of this percentage is deemed acceptable by the authority.

The precedents are also of a more traditional design, in keeping with the neighbouring properties. As a result, the proposal, like the precedents, seek to be in keeping with this and will allow for betterment on the site in regard to aesthetics and character of the area.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

The national Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the planning policies and how they should be applied.

SECTION 13

Section 13 of the NPPF relates to protecting Greenbelt land. In regard to this proposal, part 149d is most relevant and states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the green belt with the following exceptions:

“d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;”

This proposal seeks to work in line with this as it replaces a dwelling so retains the use and it is not materially larger than the one it proposes to replace.

LOCAL PLANNING POLICY

Through consulting the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (SELLP), the relevant policies are policies 1,2,3,and 22. Each have been summarised below and justification provided to demonstrate the proposals adherence to each policy.

Policy 1

According to policy 1 of SELLP, the site is categorised as being within the countryside. As a result, in line with the plan, development within the countryside should be:

‘permitted that is necessary to such a location and/or where it can be demonstrated that it meets the sustainable development needs of the area in terms of economic, community or environmental benefits’

The site has a permission for a dwelling on site and therefore it can be proved that the location is suitable and meets the sustainable development needs for the area. Due to the proposal being a new build, it will inherently be an improvement environmentally due to its thermal efficiency.

Policy 2

Policy 2 of SELLP relates to development management proposals and states proposals will be permitted provided that sustainable considerations are met relating specifically to nine different aspects. Those relevant to the site will be addressed individually below.

Point 1 of policy 2 relates to:

‘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’

The interior layout of the building reflects a traditional family home, suitable for modern living. The size and layout is in keeping with the existing dwelling on site, as well as adjacent dwellings. The site plan also shows an expansive garden area, providing more than adequate amenity space.

The character and appearance of the area is distinguished by agricultural buildings and dwelling houses of a traditional style. As a result the proposal is in line with the character and appearance of the area in regard to architectural style and land use.

Point 2 of policy 2 relates to:

‘quality of design and orientation’

The proposal is in line with this due to the well-considered design of the dwelling, utilising quality materials, in keeping with those of adjacent dwellings. The orientation has also been considered, as other dwellings along Birds Drove have their principle elevation facing the road. The proposal follows this trend.

Point 4 of policy 2 relates to:

‘access and vehicle generation levels’

The previous application allowed for a new culvert to be constructed which has been carried out. Permission from Drainage Board obtained.

Point 5 of policy 2 states that the proposal consider

‘the capacity of existing community services and infrastructure’

The proposal will also not impact on community services and infrastructure any further than the existing permission would, which itself is minimal due to the existing approval being for a single dwelling.

Point 6 of policy 2 relates to

‘impact upon neighbouring land users by reason of noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion’

The proposal will not have a negative impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion due to the proposal being for a single

dwelling to replace an existing dwelling. As stated, the recent permission on site should be treated as an existing dwelling.

Point 8 of policy 2 states that considerations should be made in relation to the

'impact or enhancement for areas of natural habitats and historical buildings and heritage assets'

The proposal will not negatively impact natural habitats or historical buildings/heritage assets. In fact the proposed dwelling will enhance the setting of the nearby properties 'Mala Wala' and 'Fairview'.

The other point of policy 2 not discussed are not relevant to the proposal. As a result the proposal is in line with all the relevant points of policy 2.

Policy 3

Policy 3 of the SELLP relates to the design of new development.

The policy states that:

'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.'

The proposal is in line with this point of policy as it offers a high quality and inclusive design and layout. It also makes innovative use of traditional styles and materials through the inclusion of traditional vernacular materials.

The proposed design incorporates traditional styles and methods of construction appropriate to the local region, and improves the character and quality of the area.

It follows on to state that development proposals will demonstrate how certain issues will be secured.

Those that are relevant to the proposal are included below and assessed as to how the proposal mitigates or solves the potential issues.

'the landscape character of the location'

The proposal will respect the landscape character of the location through retaining a similar scale and ridge height of the neighbouring dwelling scale. As mentioned the design is in keeping with the character of its location.

'the provision of facilities for the storage of refuse/recycling bins, storage and/or parking of bicycles and layout of car parking;'

The car parking layout is included on the site plan and shows an appropriate amount for the dwelling size.

'residential amenity;'

The amenity space for the dwelling is more than adequate given the large site.

‘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;’

Although indicative at this stage, the site plan shows the retention , enhancement and addition to landscaping features on site.

Policy 22

Policy 22 refers to replacement dwellings in the countryside, for which this application proposes to replace an existing dwelling within the countryside.

The policy notes that replacement dwellings in this location will be permitted providing the following elements:

‘the residential use of the building to be replaced (the original building) has not been abandoned’

The residential use of the existing building has not been abandoned as due to the approved application ‘H17-0531-21’ the use is currently residential and no further application has been submitted to vary this.

‘the original building is also permanent, has not become derelict and is not the result of a temporary permission’

The original building is also permanent, has not become derelict, due to the current use being residential and is not the result of a temporary permission.

‘the original building is not of architectural or historic merit and is not capable of repair’

The original building, although of an age, is not of historic merit. It is without special architectural features which would make it of high architectural merit.

‘the replacement building is of a high standard in terms of architectural detailing and materials of construction’

The proposed dwelling conversely has been designed to a high standard of architectural detailing, utilising materials common to its locality such as red brick. Full details relating to materials can be dealt with via a suitably worded condition.

‘the replacement building is positioned on a similar footprint to the original building unless it can be demonstrated that the re-positioning would have beneficial impacts such as improving the character and appearance of the site and its locality’

As mentioned, the building’s footprint is proposed not to be varied from the existing dwelling.

PRE- APPLICATION ADVICE

Pre application advice was not sought on this occasion, however both the two applications referred to as precedents received favourable responses it would not have been unreasonable to expect the same.

DESIGN

MATERIALS

This proposal seeks to utilise traditional materials, red brick, pantiles and slates to ensure sensitivity to the local vernacular.

DESIGN AND MASSING

U-VALUES & AIRTIGHTNESS

U-Values assigned to a building element represent its ability to transmit heat from a warm space to a cold space within a building. The lower the value, the better insulated the element is.

With a new build it is much easier to create an airtight, well insulated dwelling and avoid issues which arise from not fully knowing the history of the building or original construction. A new build also provides the opportunity for creating a well- insulated and sealed building.

The building regulations include different targets for existing buildings undergoing conversion and new build dwellings. This is because by the nature of a conversion, they are unable to achieve the same thermal efficiency as new dwellings.

Approved Document L1B: Conservation of fuel and power in existing dwellings outlines U-Value requirements for the new thermal elements in existing buildings. These are shown below in table 1.

Table 1

Standards for New thermal Elements in Existing Buildings	
Element	Standard W/m ² K
Wall	0.28
Roof	0.16*0.18 (dependent on construction type)
Floors	0.22

Approved Document L1A: Conversion of fuel and power in new dwellings outlines U-Value requirements for new build dwellings based in a concurrent notional dwelling. These are shown below in table 2.

Table 2

Summary of concurrent notional dwelling specification	
Wall	0.18
Roof	0.13
Floor	0.13

Standards for Airtightness are also higher for new dwellings than existing as Approved document L1A: Conversion of fuel and power in new dwellings states a required airtightness level of 5.0m³/h m². By comparison Approved Document L1B: Conversion of fuel and power in existing buildings mentions airtightness and states the following:

‘The building fabric should be constructed so that there are no reasonably avoidable thermal bridges in the insulation layers caused by gaps within the various elements such as those around window and door openings. Reasonable provision should also be made to reduce unwanted air leakage through the new envelope the new envelope parts. The work should comply with all the requirements of schedule 1, but particular attention should be paid to parts F and J.’

It then follows on to state that ‘it is impractical to expect thermal bridge and temperature factor calculations to work in existing buildings.’.

Therefore the building regulations acknowledge that converted existing buildings can never be expected to achieve the same levels of thermal efficiency as new build dwellings. As a result by the nature of the proposal being a new build rather than a conversion, it is already an improvement on the site in regard to thermal efficiency.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the proposal seeks to provide a better alternative to converting and extending the existing barn on the site through improvements to aesthetics, both in regard to the materials and design of the new dwelling, but also through its relocation on site, more in keeping with surrounding dwellings.

The proposed new build will also enable the dwelling to be more efficiently run, make more efficient use of resources and be more resilient to any impact caused by climate change. FRA produced by S Hemmings suggests raising the FFL by 300mm. Copy attached. Appendix 1.

The proposal is also in line with the precedents discussed within the district which were granted permission, therefore the proposal should be seen in the same light.

As a result, the application should be recommended for approval as it offers great overall benefit in comparison to the approved scheme.