



1. BACKGROUND AND PRESENT SITUATION

- 1.1. Following a firmly positive recommendation at pre-app stage that a formal application would be welcomed, a Full Planning Application for this proposal was submitted 02 December 2016. The sketch proposals submitted for pre-app advice were on a slightly larger site area than the scheme submitted for the subsequent full application, but with the two pairs of semis rather than one pair of semi-detached houses and one detached house as submitted with the subsequent full application. The density of development (dwellings per hectare) reduced as a result by approximately 15%, making a generally more relaxed proposal from a density point of view
- 1.2. On 23 January 17 David Grant notified TaC Architects of concerns raised by Chairman's Panel when reviewing the submitted application, on perceived grounds of possible over-development. TaC Architects examined this suggestion and presented a clear Planning Statement which demonstrated that the proposals were clearly in keeping with existing development in the area, including a recently approved similar development adjacent to 217 Bridge Road. This clarification was accepted by the Case Officer as a valid justification of the proposals and the application moved on towards the Planning Committee for a decision. The

application went forward with an unequivocal recommendation to approve, and also with the blessing of LCC Highways.

- 1.3. An interesting situation developed as the application was considered by Committee, and this is available for viewing on the SHDC Planning Committee Meeting webcast. The scheme was presented to Committee, following which the Officer's recommendation to approve was accepted and was moved and seconded for approval by Committee. Cllr Alcock however, then queried the parking and traffic movements within the site. The Chairman expanded rather vigorously upon this and built a somewhat emotive case based entirely upon an erroneous assumption that vehicles would not be able to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. Committee were swayed by this view and, rather than asking for a deferral for clarification, decided to reject the application out of hand, based entirely upon rhetoric and misinformed conjecture rather than fact.
- 1.4. It should be noted that LCC Highways, the expert Authority on matters of traffic movement related to development proposals, responded clearly to the LPA consultation that it did not wish to object to the proposals. Indeed, it stated that *"Having given due regard to the appropriate local and national planning policy guidance, (in particular the National Planning Policy Framework), Lincolnshire County Council (as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority) has concluded that the proposed development is acceptable and accordingly, does not wish to object to this planning application."*
- 1.5. This application is a straight re-application with additional material to allay Committee's unfounded fears that vehicle manoeuvring within the site is not possible to allow entering and leaving in a forward gear.

2. SITE ASSESSMENT

- 2.1. The site sits within an established row of mixed, single storey and two storey semi-detached and detached dwellings, in a residential area of Sutton Bridge.
- 2.2. It is difficult to determine a specific 'design character' for this area of Sutton Bridge, as there is an eclectic mix of styles, designs and materials.
- 2.3. Site levels are largely flat and horizontal to all intents and purposes, and match the surrounding areas, however, the plot does slope at the front to the road level.
- 2.4. According to the Environment Agency Flood Maps, the site sits within Flood Zone 3 and therefore a Flood Risk Assessment will be submitted to accompany this application.

3. EVALUATION

3.1. Opportunities

- 3.1.1. There is an opportunity to make better use of available land, and to provide three new dwellings within plots not dissimilar to those in the immediately surrounding area, and in a position close to all local amenities and the local transport systems.

3.2. Constraints

- 3.2.1. The building's designs and siting are important to a successful outcome, and any issues of potential overlooking and any possible overbearing effect or loss of amenity on neighbouring properties will need to be addressed.
- 3.2.2. Any residential development proposal should take account of the general

character and grain of the established area.

4. DESIGN

- 4.1. The design of the proposed dwellings, which are the subject of this application are intended to reflect and reinforce the buildings seen in the area and produce a
- 4.2. The houses are to be brick built, with a red/brown multi facing brick, with a concrete slate roof. The design is to reflect the varying styles of construction seen with the vicinity of the site and allow the property to fit with the street scene.
- 4.3. Great effort has been made to ensure no other dwelling will be overlooked, with only one side facing window on the ground floor and no side facing windows on the first floor to mitigate any potential for overlooking.
- 4.4. The site allows for parking, and manoeuvring as shown in this current application planning drawing.

5. ACCESS AND SUSTAINABILITY

- 5.1. The proposed house is within a sizable village, with a general store, butchers, and public houses within less than a few minutes' walk. The village also has thriving community facility. Sutton Bridge is deemed a main service centre.
- 5.2. Access to the site is possible by foot or by vehicle. Disabled visitors can drive, or be driven up to the principal entrance. A drawing is included as part of this re-application, showing clearly that a typical family car can easily enter and leave the site in a forward gear.
- 5.3. A bus service operates along Bridge Road, with a bus stop within 20m of the site, providing easy access to Peterborough, Spalding, Holbeach and beyond. Spalding has a railway station so it is not difficult to access the national network by public transport.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1. It is considered that the proposed development is suitable for its site and the area generally. A feeling echoed by the planning officer during addition pre-application advice he stated, '*The proposal site is immediately adjacent to the proposed defined settlement limits of Sutton Bridge which is allocated as a main service centre. On this basis, the proposal site is considered to be in a sustainable location and we would welcome a planning application for the proposed dwellings.*'
- 6.2. The previous application for this site was rejected on the following basis alone:-
The proposal is considered to be overdevelopment of the site in light of the parking arrangements and the inability for vehicles to leave the site in a forward gear, particularly in relation to the detached unit. As such the proposal is contrary to both Policy SG14 of the South Holland Local Plan (2006) and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), particularly section 7 which seeks a high quality of design
It is clear that this key assumption upon which the decision to refuse Planning Permission rested entirely was erroneous and that since all else was considered to be satisfactory with the proposal, then Committee must now be duty-bound to accept the recommendation of its Planning Officers and the expert opinion of LCC Highways to approve this application.