DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H18-0144-24**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs R Lanaghan**
Proposal:	Conversion of Coach House to Annexe in Association with Host Dwelling		
Location:	Rear Of 68 Bridge Road Sutton Bridge Spalding		
Terminal Date:	11th April 2024		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
29	The Historic Environment

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023)

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This application is for the conversion of the rear coach house to an annexe in association with the host property, at 68 Bridge Road, Sutton Bridge.

Site Description

68 Bridge Road acts as the host property to this proposal, and forms a part of a group of 3 listed terraced, C19th townhouses. Historic England describes the properties like so:

"Terrace of 3 houses. Early C19. Red brick. Slate roof. 2 ridge stacks. Slate coped gables. Paired bracketed eaves. Double depth plan. Two and a half storeys, 9 bays. Doorway with panelled door, glazing bar fanlight, panelled reveal and pilastered doorcase with dosserets supporting an open pediment, to the left are 4 glazing bar sashes, a doorway with similar door and doorcase, 2 similar sashes and on the far left a doorway with similar door and doorcase. Above is a single blind window opening, to the left are 4 glazing bar sashes, a single similar blind opening, 2 similar glazing bar sashes and on the far left a single similar blind opening. The windows and openings on the top floor follow the same pattern but are smaller. All sashes and blind openings with cambered arched flush wedge lintels."

The host building itself is a historic stables and cart shed, that serviced the main properties that front onto Bridge Road. Built of brick and notably featuring a large arched cart door to the centre. The other 2 properties on the listed terrace have already converted their sections of the structure to modern uses, and despite some general degradation on the Wharf Street elevation to elements such as fenestration, and also the historic replacement of the tiled roof with corrugated metal sheeting, the structure remains in good form.

The area in general is characterised by residential development of various eras and styles.

History

H18-0729-23

Conversion of Coach House to annex in association with host dwelling. Approved on 14-02-24.

Consultation Responses

Sutton Bridge Parish Council

Stated that advice should be sought from the environment agency.

It should be noted that this application is the Listed Building Consent application to accompany the full permission application H18-0729-23 which has been approved and wherein the Environment Agency were consulted and raised no objections.

Planning Considerations

Evaluation

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The adopted South-East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, NPPF are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Principle of Development

Policy 1 of the SELLP sets out the settlement hierarchy in respect of delivering sustainable development, which meets the social and economic needs of the area whilst protecting and enhancing the environment; in order to provide enough choice of land for housing to satisfy local need, whilst making more sustainable use of land, and to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural plots by developing in sustainable locations and at appropriate densities.

Policy 1 expresses this sustainable hierarchy of settlements, ranking the settlements deemed to be most sustainable in descending order. The most sustainable locations for development are situated within the 'Sub-Regional Centres', followed by 'Main Service Centres'. Lower down the hierarchy are areas of limited development opportunity including Minor Service Centres, with areas of development constraint comprising 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. The countryside is at

the bottom of the settlement hierarchy and represents the least sustainable location.

The site is within Sutton Bridge, A Main Service Centre as defined by Policy 1 of the SELLP. Within the settlement boundaries of the Main Service Centres 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.

As the proposal is within the curtilage of an existing dwelling and all works would be subservient to the host, the principle of development is sound.

Heritage Impact

The Local Planning Authority does not consider there to be any risk of harm to the associated heritage asset caused by this proposal. The host structure is considered to be curtilage listed, to the host structure (64, 66 and 68 Bridge Road). However, the building is neither listed in its own right or mentioned within the specific listing of the host structure. This, in conjunction with the fact that the building in question, whilst having qualities of its own, is a relatively unremarkable C19th agricultural building, suggests that the host structure cannot be of particularly great value to the listing. The works will include the full restoration of the historic outbuilding, including a full re-roofing, replacing the existing metal sheet roof with a natural slate roof, restoring what would have originally been the roof covering for this building. All other elements of this proposal, apart from the replacement of doors and windows are internal. The proposed internal alterations are minor layout changes and being stud walling, would be fully reversible if need be, although internal layout alterations could be said to remove readability of the original historic layout.

Paragraph 205 of the NPPF categorises harm to heritage assets within 3 classes; substantial harm, total loss, or less than substantial harm. In this instance, all of the elements of the proposal are deemed to be improvements to the state of the historic building, and therefore the wider historic environment, as they represent the restoration of a finer condition to the property - particularly the restoration of an original slate roof, which shall greatly improve the image and authenticity of the property. However, an exception to this is the internal layout alterations, which for the reasons listed above, could be considered to be 'less than substantial harm'.

As confirmed by Paragraph 208 of the NPPF, where a development proposal can be considered to represent 'less than substantial harm', the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing the structure's optimal viable use. In this case, there is no wider public benefit against which to weigh, apart from the minor public interest in seeing an element of the historic environment restored to a decent condition and put into a viable use. However, in this instance, less than substantial harm can also be considered to be a positive force upon the appreciation of the asset, particularly as it represents the restoration of the historic building to a viable use, and balanced against the other much more positive elements of the proposal, the balance is clearly in favour of approval. Furthermore, the loss of interior layout is mitigated against by the extensive building recording conducted by PCAS archaeology.

Flood Risk

The proposal site is situated in a location identified as being with Flood Risk Zone 3 and as such, it is necessary for a flood risk assessment to have accompanied the application. Furthermore, South Holland District Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies the site as being a 'Danger to Most' during a 1% fluvial/0.5% tidal event, and that the Fluvial & Tidal depth is 1-2m.

As this case is an application for change of use, as per Paragraph 033 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) it is not necessary for the sequential test to be applied. However, Paragraph 048 of the PPG does conclude that a change of use may lead to a greater vulnerability to flooding depending upon classification and that as such, all proposals must demonstrate that users shall not be exposed to flood risk during the lifetime of the building.

In this instance, the appended Flood Risk Assessment confirms mitigation strategies, which shall include flood resilient construction up to a height of 1.5m. Furthermore, the ground floor is proposed to only be a utility room and lobby, with all of the domestic living space situated on the 1st floor.

As such, when the flood resilient construction is mandated by means of condition, the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the users of the property would not be at an enhanced risk of

flooding for the lifetime of the building, and therefore, the propsosal passes the requirements for Policy 4 of the SELLP.

Residential Amenity

The Local Planning Authority does not consider there to be any material risk to residential amenity. The proposal seeks no dimensional alterations to the property and no additional or enlarged window or door openings, and as such, the proposal cannot be said to present any material risk of overlooking or overshadowing to any neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

For the reasons listed above, this application is deemed to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 29 of the SELLP in addition to Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF. Therefore, the proposal is recommended for approval.

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.