

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No: H18-0429-23 **Applicant:** South Holland District Council - Property Services

Proposal: Proposed concrete hardstanding for vehicle parking

Location: 72 Princes Street Sutton Bridge Spalding

Terminal Date: 4th July 2023

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02 Development Management
03 Design of New Development

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Section 12 - Achieving Well Designed Places

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

Proposed concrete hardstanding area measuring 3600mm (width) by 4800mm (length) to the front of 72 Princes Street, Sutton Bridge. The area will have a maximum depth of 200mm. It is to be constructed of a geotextile base with a concrete top.

Site Description

The site is located within the settlement boundary of Sutton Bridge, as outlined in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP). The site is located relatively centrally, lying to the north of Bridge Road. The site is approximately 750 metres west of the river Nene and approximately 250 metres east of Sutton Bridge Primary School.

The site itself lies within a residential area. The property is a semi-detached, two-storey property constructed of red brick. The dwelling is typical of Princes Street, which primarily comprises of similar semi-detached properties.

Relevant History

H18-0599-19 - Full. Rear single-storey flat roofed extension. Approved 25/07/19.

H18-0924-19 - NMA. Rear single-storey flat roof extension - approved under H18-0599-19 - Addition of external door to side elevation for improved access to rear garden. Approved 07/10/19.

Consultation Responses

Lincolnshire County Council Highways/SuDS

No objections: The proposed concrete parking area is an Assisted Living improvement for the benefit of the resident of the property. Drivers entering the highway at this point have adequate visibility of any approaching traffic to be able to conduct this manoeuvre safely. Therefore, 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 would not be expected to have an unacceptable impact upon highway and so does not wish to object to this planning application.

Informatives are advised.

Planning Considerations

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2021 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, that they are visually attractive, as a result of good architecture, and are sympathetic to local character. Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP, states that 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.

Along Princes Street, areas of hardstanding to the front of dwellings are already extremely common. Therefore, the addition of a concreted area to the front of the property would not appear incongruous in the context that it is located.

The materials proposed would be in keeping with the character of the area, ensuring that the development appears well blended into the street scene.

The scale of the proposal, measuring 3600mm (width) by 4800mm (length), is comparable to the aforementioned existing areas of hardstanding. The plot is of sufficient size to accommodate the concreted area, while still maintaining a level of greenery and a sufficient and useable amenity space.

The proposal therefore conforms to Policy 2 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of design.

Impacts Upon Resident Amenity

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF amongst other matters, seeks places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP set out residential amenity and relationship to existing development and land uses as main considerations when making planning decisions.

The proposed addition of hardstanding would have no impact upon neighbouring amenity in the long term. Naturally, there would be no loss of privacy as a result of the development and after the initial construction, which itself would take place over a short period, no additional noise pollution would be created as a result of the development.

The proposal conforms to Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan in terms of amenity impacts and the provisions of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Drainage

Policy 4 of the SELLP relates to flood risk and drainage. Naturally, the works are too minor in scale to have any tangible impact upon flood risk.

The potential for concern regarding drainage is limited. While the area would be impermeable, it is flanked by grassed areas. These would be capable of taking any additional surface water run-off as a result of the paving. In addition, the works are minor in scale and therefore the relative impact upon localised drainage would be limited.

The proposal conforms to Policy 4 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan in terms of drainage and Section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Parking

Paragraph 111 of the NPPF advises that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. Policy 2 details that proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to access and vehicle generation.

Policy 36, to be read in conjunction with Appendix 6 of the Local Plan, sets out minimum vehicle parking standards. This policy details that "all new development, including change of use, should provide vehicle and cycle parking, in accordance with the minimum Parking Standards adopted by the Local Planning Authority (in Appendix 6), unless a high quality-design can demonstrate that a lower standard of provision delivers the requirements" as set out within the policy.

The proposal will create an additional parking space, further reducing the need for on-street parking at the site and in turn having the possibility of improving the flow of traffic on the street. The proposal therefore conforms to Policy 36 and Appendix 6 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan and Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of parking arrangement.

Planning Balance

The proposal would have a negligible impact upon the character of the area. Hardstanding is already well established within the street scene, and as such, the proposed addition would not appear out of place.

No significant detrimental impacts are expected as a result of this proposal. There would be no additional noise pollution or loss of privacy.

The proposal would cause a minor increase in the levels of surface water run-off. However, the small-scale of development means that any impact would be insignificant and could be easily absorbed by the adjacent grassed areas.

The proposal would further reduce the need for on-street parking, in turn improving the flow of traffic along Princes Street.

Conclusion

The proposal conforms to Policies 2, 3, 4, 36 and Appendix 6 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework. The planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

The recommendation is for delegated 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.