DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H18-1160-19**	**Applicant:**	**S E King Building Contractors Ltd**
Proposal:	Erection of dwelling - outline approval H18-0209-18		
Location:	Adj. 217 Bridge Road Sutton Bridge Spalding		
Terminal Date:	5th March 2020		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
04	Approach to Flood Risk
30	Pollution
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 12. Achieving well-designed places
Section 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
Section 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

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

This is a planning application that seeks permission for the reserved matters of development for one dwelling (outline approval application ref. H18-0209-18) at land adjacent to 217 Bridge Road, Sutton Bridge.

Conditions 3, 4, 5 and 6 of H18-0209-18 request the submission of details and subsequent approval by the Local Planning Authority on the following features of the development.

Condition 3: i) the layout, scale and external appearance of building(s), including a schedule of external materials to be used; ii) the means of access to the site; iii) the landscaping of the site; iv) the means of sewage and surface water disposal; v) the existing and proposed site levels and floor levels of the buildings and hard surfaced areas.

Condition 4: scheme of landscaping and tree planting indicating, inter alia, the number, species, heights on planting and positions of all trees in respect of the land to which that application relates, together with details of post-planting maintenance.

Condition 5: details of the proposed boundary treatment, including a schedule of materials, and details of the size and species of any hedging

Condition 6: The following flood risk mitigation measures detailed within the FRA shall be carried out: i) the dwelling will be a minimum two storey development; ii) finished floor levels will be set at 1 metre (4.77mAOD) above existing ground level; iii) flood resilience and resistance measures will be incorporated up to 300mm above finished floor level, iv) no sleeping accommodation at ground floor level.

Site Description

The site is located at the north-western end of Bridge Road. It is part of a short frontage development on the southern part of the road. To the south-east, there is two dwellings within an old cottage. To the north-west, there are two pairs of semi-detached houses which were built around 2016.

The site is overall vacant. The floor is laid in sand and gravel. A picket fence is on the front boundary. The boundaries on both sides are enclosed by nearly 2 metre high timber close board fencing on the adjacent boundaries. There is a low timber close board fence along the rear boundary.

History

H18-0209-18 - New residential dwelling - Approved

Consultation Responses

Lincolnshire County Council as Local Highway and Lead Flood Authority

No objection.

Planning Considerations

Design and layout

Para 124 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019 establishes among others that development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting; and create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. At the local tier, Policy 3 of 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".

Wienerberger Hataway Brindled facing bricks would be used for the external walls of the house and the roof tiles would be terracotta pantiles. The colour of the brickwork would relate well with that of the adjacent semi-detached properties whereas the reddish roof tiles would be similar in colour with

those on the neighbouring cottage. The dark grey vertical boarding on the front elevation around the garage door would provide a contemporary appearance to the house which is overall traditional in keeping with the rural character of the area.

The soft landscaping strategy will retain the existing trees on the front verge. A strawberry tree (evergreen) and a magnolia would be planted to the front and rear respectively. The hard landscaping consist of gravel surfaced drive; footpaths on the sides of the house and rear patio to be laid in tan smooth paving; and garden area laid in turf. The existing 1.8 metre close board timber fence will remain on the boundary with the semi-detached property. An additional fence of same height will be erected on the opposite boundary. The existing nearly 1 metre high fence will not be altered on the rear boundary. In general, the landscaping strategy would be sympathetic with the built and natural environments in the surroundings.

Revised plans have been submitted to remove decking on the rear patio and therefore avoid overlooking between the future occupiers of the house and the existing residents at No. 223. In doing so, the design is such that the amenity standards do not result undermined by reason of the development.

The proposed site layout includes a new vehicular access from Bridge Road to the site. The narrowest width would be 3.04 metre. The County Highways Authority has raised no objection neither made any comment with regards to the proposed site access.

Appendix 6 of SELLP sets out the minimum requirements for car parking provision. 3 spaces for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms. The approved dwelling would host 4 bedrooms, therefore 3 spaces would be at least provided within the curtilage. No marking is proposed on the site layout although the front driveway is sufficiently spacious to accommodate two cars side-by-side on the eastern part off the tree and one further to the front of the garage door. Thus, the details of parking provision comply with the local policies.

Policy 4 of SELLP estates among other requirements that new development within an area of flooding should incorporate appropriate flood resistance and resilience measures to ensure an appropriate level of safety for its lifetime; and the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).

Finished floors levels would be set at 4.77m AOD as per the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). Likewise, all bedrooms would be on the first floor. Thus, the lifetime of the development would be protected from flooding of a 1 in 100 year return period and the safety of the future occupiers would be acceptable in extreme flooding events.

2 no. soakaways (2m x 2m) are proposed under the gravelled drive to the front of the property and one further (4m x 2m) near the rear boundary. Foul water would be conveyed to the existing manhole to the front of the adjacent semi-detached property. It is unknown any evidence of poor soil permeability in the area. In light of the house footprint and extension of hard surfaced areas, it is overall considered that 2 no. soakaways would be able to manage the surface water runoff caused after the development. Although the principle for implementing the aforementioned drainage strategy is acceptable, the suitability of both soakaways and manhole connection will be tested and subsequently approved with SHDC Building Control department at a later stage.

Conclusion

The details of the development submitted with this planning application are acceptable. Taking into account the considerations above, the proposal is in accordance with Policies 2, 3, 4 and 30 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019); and Sections 12, 14 and 15 of National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

It is accordingly recommended to approve this application via delegated decision.

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.