

Development Management Delegated Decision Report

B/20/0501



SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

Application Reference	B/20/0501		
Application Type	Full Planning Permission		
Proposal	Internal and external alterations to the whole building including the conversion of No.2 Skirbeck Road (half of the building) from a six-bedroom House in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) to four individual bed-sits / flats (Class C3)		
Location	2-4 Skirbeck Road, Boston, PE21 6DA		
Applicant	Alistair Arundell, Smart Move (Boston) Limited		
Agent	Mr Gillick, Gillick Brothers		
Received Date:	18-Dec-2020	Consultation Expiry Date:	17-Feb-2021
Valid Date:	20-Jan-2021	Statutory Expiry Date:	17-Mar-2021
Date of Site Visit:	22-Mar-2021	Extension of Time Date:	01-Apr-2021
Objections received?	None		
5 day notification record:	Not applicable		
Councillors notified	Date	Response received – date	Ok to continue
Recommendation	GRANT Planning Permission		
Report by:	Simon Eldred		
Date:	25 th March 2021		

OFFICER REPORT

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site is located on the northern side of Skirbeck Road, Boston, and contains a pair of semi-detached buildings built in red brick, and with roofs in a mixture of tile colours, types, and materials. The buildings are largely three-storeys in height, with single-storey elements on their western and northern elevations. There is a brick wall of approximately 0.75m in height enclosing a small garden onto Skirbeck Road in front of no. 2, and there are gardens to the rear of both buildings (separated by a 2m-high brick wall), and a gravel-surfaced parking/manoeuvring area to the east of no. 4.

The buildings appear to be in residential use, and there are further dwellings to their north, north-west, east and south-east. The property to the south (on the opposite side of Skirbeck Road) is disused former industrial land, and that to the west is a public house/restaurant.

The buildings are Grade II listed, and are located within the Boston Conservation Area. Several other, nearby buildings are listed including:



- 1-9 South Terrace; and
- 33 St John's Place, Skirbeck Road.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL:

It is proposed to change the use of no.2 from a house in multiple occupancy (HMO) to provide:

- on the ground-floor, two bedsit flats:
 - one with a total floorspace of approximately 33m² and providing a bedroom/living room, a bathroom, a kitchen, and smaller room (presumably a utility room);
 - one with a total floorspace of approximately 39m² and providing a bedroom/living room, a kitchen, a bathroom and an entrance hall;
- on the first-floor, one bedsit flat with a total floorspace of approximately 37.5m² and providing a bedroom/living room, a bathroom, a kitchen and a hall; and
- on the second-floor, one bedsit flat with a total floorspace of approximately 34m² and providing a bedroom/living room, a kitchen, a bathroom, and a hall.

Internal alterations to no.2 are proposed to facilitate the change of use, and the following external changes to the two buildings are also proposed:

- replace the existing late 20th Century ground-floor door and window in no. 4's front elevation with a new door and window within the original 18th Century openings and to match (in materials, appearance, detail and finish) their original counterparts on no.2's front elevation;
- replace the existing 20th Century brick boundary wall in front of no. 2 with 1.2m-high metal railings on a new stone plinth – the railings to extend approximately 5m further east;
- refurbish the roof of no.4, and replace the existing roof covering on its rear slope with clay pantiles to match the front slope;
- reinstate recently removed external double-doors in no. 2's northern elevation and
- reinstate/replace two uPVC windows in no.2's rear elevation with timber-framed sliding sash windows to suitable period detail.

RELEVANT HISTORY:

In 2000, full planning permission (B/00/0343) and listed building consent (B/00/0344) were granted for the erection of a 2m high close boarded fence.

In 2009: full planning permission (B/09/0229) was granted for change of use from a dwelling (Class C3) to a house in multiple occupation (sui generis); and Listed Building Consent (B/09/0230) was refused for change of use from a dwelling (Class C3) to a house in multiple occupation (sui generis).

In 2020, applications for listed building consent (B/20/0265) and full planning permission (B/20/0266) for change of use from a 5-bed HMO to 4 bedsit flats and associated alterations were withdrawn.

RELEVANT DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES AND DOCUMENTS:

The **South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036** shows the application site as being within Boston's Settlement Boundary, and within the Conservation Area. Policies of relevance to this proposal are:

- Policy 1: Spatial Strategy;
- Policy 2: Development Management;
- Policy 3: Design of New Development;
- Policy 4: Approach to Flood Risk;
- Policy 21: Houses in Multiple Occupation and the Sub-Division of Dwellings;
- Policy 29: The Historic Environment;
- Policy 30: Pollution; and
- Policy 36: Vehicle and Cycle Parking.

OTHER RELEVANT DOCUMENTS / LEGISLATION / GUIDANCE:

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

At the heart of the 2019 Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The following sections are relevant to this proposal:

- Section 4 – Decision-making;
- Section 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes;
- Section 9 – Promoting sustainable transport;
- Section 11 – Making effective use of land;
- Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places;
- Section 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change;
- Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Boston Borough Council's Environmental Health department indicates that it has no objections.

The Witham Fourth District Internal Drainage Board asks to be informed if there are any changes to the stated arrangement for the disposal of surface water or treated water.

The Environment Agency initially objected on the basis that an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) had not been submitted. Following the receipt of a revised FRA, the Agency withdrew its objection, subject to the inclusion of a condition reading *"The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), RM Associates February 2021 V1, and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:*

- *Finished floor levels to be set as existing at 5.5m above Ordnance Datum (AOD);*
- *Flood resilience and resistance measures to be incorporated into the proposed development as stated.*

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently remain in place".

The Agency also:

- recommended the installation of flood resistant doors or demountable defences, although it accepted that the buildings' listed status would restrict options; and
- commented that the existing finished floor level of the property is sufficient to prevent risk to life.

Boston Borough Council's Housing Standards department indicates that it has no objections, and assumes that *"the conversion will be done with building regulation compliance so fire detection and separation will be to an acceptable level."*

Lincolnshire County Council (the Local Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority) indicates that car parking is not essential because the site is located in a central urban area where services and facilities can be accessed by sustainable travel options. Consequently it concludes that the proposal is acceptable, and indicates that it does not object.

Heritage Lincolnshire initially identified that the proposals include:

- a number of positive elements, namely the re-instatement of the door portico and window on the front elevation, and the use of traditional roofing materials. They asked that *"conditions on the new portico, reinstatement of the historic rear doors (method statement) and samples of roofing materials would need to be applied to any approval"*; and
- some elements that will adversely impact on the character of the listed building and its internal features, namely:
 - the excessive height of the proposed new 1.6m-high front boundary railings;
 - proposed installation of a uPVC window, and failure to remove existing uPVC windows which have been recently installed without consent; and
 - the sub-division of the front first-floor bedroom.

In response to these comments, the applicant indicated that:

- the boundary railings would be reduced to 1.4m in height;
- the proposals would be amended to omit uPVC windows and to show the replacement of existing uPVC examples; and
- *"the subdivision proposed is critical to being able to create a workable, self-contained flat ... Whilst I appreciate that it is not ideal and will have an effect on that particular room, it will not fundamentally change the character of the building, particularly as the partition would be a reversible element; enabling the original room layout to be reinstated in future. Impact can be reduced by reducing the 2 proposed door openings through the central wall to 1 (door to bathroom off kitchen). I believe there is sufficient space to attach a partition wall between the cupboard and fireplace without damaging either historic fitting. Careful carpentry would be used so that fixings are minimal and only affect wall plaster."*

and the proposals were amended accordingly.

Heritage Lincolnshire commented on these amended proposals to indicate that:

- Railing height - should be reduced to 1.2m;
- uPVC windows – *"the proposals have been adjusted, But I'm not sure that the correct window was identified. I thought it was the one above the doors though I may be incorrect;"* and
- First-floor sub-division – *"this is still in place, and so still an issue."*

In response to these comments, the proposals were amended to reduce the height of the railings to 1.2m.

THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

No third party representations have been received.

EVALUATION:

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that determination must be made in accordance with the Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Potential impacts upon the listed buildings themselves are considered in listed building consent application B/20/0502. Therefore, the key considerations with regard to this application are:

- matters of principle;
- whether the proposal will result in the loss of a family-sized dwelling in a high density residential street;
- impact on the amenity of neighbouring land users;
- impact upon the character and appearance of the area and upon other heritage assets;
- whether adequate provision is made for the storage and disposal of refuse and recycling;
- whether the proposals will have harmful effects through an increase in on-street parking, impaired highway safety or by impeding proper access to the area;
- whether the site has good access (by walking and cycling) to community facilities, services, public transport and local employment;
- whether an adequate standard of residential accommodation and residential amenity is provided for future occupiers;
- whether adequate provision is made for communal gardens/amenity areas; and
- flood risk.

Matters of principle

Policy 1 of the Local Plan identifies that Boston is a settlement to which development should be directed. It goes on to identify that development which will support Boston's role as a Sub-Regional Centre should be permitted in a location such as this. Although these provisions are not particularly specific, it is nonetheless considered that this proposal accords with the provisions of Policy 1 of the Local Plan.

Policy 21 of the Local Plan identifies that proposals for the sub-division of dwellings will be permitted, subject to 8 criteria. Thus, the principle of the sub-division of this dwelling is acceptable, provided that the detailed objectives of Policy 21 and other relevant Policies are met (see the sections which follow).

Loss of a family-sized dwelling in a high density residential street

Criterion 1 of Policy 21 identifies that a proposal for the sub-division of a dwelling will be permitted provided *"it would not result in the loss of family-sized dwellings in high-density residential streets of predominantly terraced and/or semi-detached properties"*. The Policy's reasoned justification indicates that *"it is important, therefore, that an approach is taken to the ... sub-division of existing properties, which allows only those that do not impact upon the overall supply of family-sized homes. In applying this policy, 'family-sized dwellings' means houses with 3 or more bedrooms and 'high-density residential streets' should be taken as meaning streets of predominantly terraced and/or semi-detached properties."*

At present, no. 2 provides 6 bedrooms, a kitchen, a dining room, 2 bathrooms and a store, and is therefore sufficiently large to fall within the Policy's definition of a 'family-sized dwelling'.

However, although there are residential properties to the application site's north, north-west, east and south-east, this part of Skirbeck Road is in mixed use - with a pub/restaurant to the site's west, disused industrial land to its south, and a public park, a day nursery and the car park to Boston College all within 100m to its east. Consequently, it does not fall within the Policy's definition of a 'high-density residential street'.

It is therefore considered that the proposals meet the requirements of criterion 1 of Policy 21.

Impact on the amenity of neighbouring land users

Criterion 2 of Policy 21 identifies that a proposal for the sub-division of dwellings will be permitted provided *"it would not significantly harm the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining or neighbouring properties by way of noise, overlooking, general disturbance or impact on visual amenity."* Policies 2, 3 and 30 of the Local Plan also require the amenity of neighbouring land users to be protected.

The application site has disused former industrial land to its south, and a public house/restaurant to its west. It is considered that the proposed change of use will have no adverse impacts upon these neighbouring land uses. Although these are existing dwellings to its north, north-west, east and south-east, the proposal involves no extensions or alterations that might impact upon these dwellings in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light, dominance or outlook. Furthermore, the proposed change of use is from one residential use to another and is unlikely to significantly increase the number of occupants. Consequently, it is considered unlikely that harm to neighbours' amenities will be caused from e.g. noise or general disturbance from increased comings-and-goings – a view which is shared by the Borough Council's Environmental Health Department.

It is therefore considered that the proposals meet the requirements of Policies 2, 3 and 30, and criterion 2 of Policy 21.

Impact upon the character and appearance of the area and upon other heritage assets

Criterion 3 of Policy 21 identifies that a proposal for the sub-division of a dwelling will be permitted provided *"it would not have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, including the historic and natural environment."*

Policy 2 of the Local Plan indicates that developments will be permitted which will not have harmful impacts upon the character and appearance of the area.

Policy 29 of the Local Plan seeks the conservation and enhancement of the area's historic environment.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 confirms the duty of a local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving conservation areas and the settings of listed buildings. In the context of Sections 66 and 72 of the Act, the objective of preservation is to cause no harm. The courts have said that this statutory requirement acts as a paramount consideration – 'the first consideration for a decision maker'. Planning decisions require balanced judgement but, in that exercise, significant weight must be given to the objective of heritage conservation.

In practice, this requires a methodical approach to be followed, whereby the relevant assets that would be affected are identified, along with their significance. Consideration can then be given to any effects on this significance resulting from the proposals, which may be reduced through mitigation. If harm is identified, it is then required to establish the scale and extent of such harm, before moving on to matters such as the planning balance and weighing the public benefits arising against any identified harm.

Heritage assets affected - [N.B. Potential impacts upon 2 and 4 Skirbeck Road (which are listed buildings) are considered in application B/20/0502]. The application site forms part of the setting to other nearby listed buildings, in particular 1-9 South Terrace, and 33 St John's Place, Skirbeck Road. The site is also located within the Boston Conservation Area.

Impacts of the proposals on these assets - The proposed internal works will have no impact upon the setting of nearby listed buildings, nor the character/appearance of the Conservation Area (nor the character/appearance of the area generally).

The proposed change of use may involve the storage of an increased number of wheelie-bins in the front garden (see below), but it is considered that this would have no significantly harmful impacts upon the setting of nearby listed buildings nor the character/appearance of the Conservation Area (nor the character/appearance of the area generally).

The proposal involves relatively few changes to the buildings' external appearance. Nonetheless, it is considered that those changes which are proposed (new roof, new front door and new ground-floor front window for no. 4, and new front railings for nos. 2 and 4) will enhance the buildings' appearance, and have consequential positive impacts upon the setting of nearby listed buildings and the character/appearance of the Conservation Area (and the character/appearance of the area generally).

There is no evidence to suggest that the proposals will have adverse impacts upon the 'natural environment'.

In all, therefore, it is considered that the proposals will not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, the settings of nearby listed buildings, nor the character or appearance of the area generally. It is therefore considered that they satisfy Sections 66 and 72 of the Act, and the provisions of Policies 2 and 29, and criterion 3 of Policy 21.

Storage and disposal of refuse and recycling

Criterion 4 of Policy 21 identifies that a proposal for the sub-division of a dwelling will be permitted provided "*adequate provision is made for the storage and disposal of refuse and recycling.*"

Neither the application form/drawings nor the documents which accompany the application give an indication of how refuse and recycling bins will be accommodated. However, at the site visit, it was noted that wheelie-bins are currently kept in the front garden to no.2 - 3 wheelie-bins were present. Whilst the proposed use might require a total of 8 bins (a refuse bin and a recycling bin for each flat), the front garden is considered to be of a size that could comfortably accommodate this number of bins. It is noted that there is an outdoor area to the rear of the building, however, it is not certain if legal access can be obtained from the front of the building along the side of No. 4 Skirbeck Road. Nevertheless, the front garden will be surrounded by railings of 1.2m height, and it is considered that this will ensure that bins would

be satisfactorily secure. Furthermore, the railings will partially obscure and soften views of any bins stored in the front garden, and will ensure that they would have no significantly harmful impacts upon the street scene.

It is therefore considered that the proposals meet the requirements of criterion 4 of Policy 21.

On-street parking and highway safety

Criterion 5 of Policy 21 identifies that a proposal for the sub-division of a dwelling will be permitted provided *“it would not have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding area by way of increased on-street parking, impaired highway safety or by impeding proper access to the area.”* Policy 36 of the Local Plan indicates that all new development should provide vehicle and cycle parking in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Appendix 6. Policy 2 of the Local Plan identifies access and vehicle generation levels as a sustainable development consideration.

Appendix 6 of the Local Plan indicates that every house or flat with 3 or fewer bedrooms should provide at least 2 car parking spaces and 1 cycle parking space within the curtilage. Applying these standards to the proposals would suggest that 8 off-street car parking spaces and 4 cycle parking spaces should be provided. However, the application site contains no space for the parking of cars or bicycles, and on-street car parking on Skirbeck Road, South End and St Johns Road is prevented by double-yellow lines.

The above shortfall weighs against the proposal. However, paragraph 105 of the NPPF states that *“local parking standards ... should take into account: the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of development; the availability of and opportunities for public transport ...”*. Given the proximity of the application site to the town centre and other local services and facilities (see below) and the fact that there are nearby bus stops (see below), it is considered that there are clear opportunities for travel by means other than the private car. Consequently, it is considered that the lack of off-street parking is not a cause for concern, and that the proposal will not generate on-street parking that would be detrimental to highway safety or the amenity of the occupants of nearby residential properties, and this is a view shared by the Local Highway Authority.

Access to services, facilities and jobs

Criterion 6 of Policy 21 identifies that a proposal for the sub-division of a dwelling will be permitted provided *“the site has good access – by walking and cycling – to community facilities, services, public transport and local employment.”* The Policy’s reasoned justification indicates that *“the NPPF favours development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. Properties should therefore have good walking and cycling access to key services, facilities and a bus service (by which residents can reach such services and facilities). A distance of 400m is generally accepted as an appropriate walking distance to key services, facilities and public transport from home.”*

The application site has:

- two bus stops within 200m (one on South End and one on Skirbeck Road);
- a day nursery within a 400m walk (100m as the crow flies);
- a secondary school (Boston Grammar School) within 250m;
- a further education facility (Boston College) within 250m;

- retail facilities (a CO-OP foodstore, 2 hot food takeaways, and a charity shop) within 300m;
- significant employment locally (the Port of Boston within 400m, Boston College within 250m and the Post Office sorting office within 150m; and
- the myriad facilities, services and employment opportunities of Boston's town centre within 300m.

It is therefore considered that the proposals meet the requirements of criterion 6 of Policy 21.

Adequate standard of residential accommodation and residential amenity

Criterion 7 of Policy 21 identifies that a proposal for the sub-division of dwellings will be permitted provided *“an adequate standard of residential accommodation and residential amenity is provided for future occupiers.”* The Policy ends with *“the Nationally Described Space Standards (or any successor) will be applied to ensure that the occupiers have adequate floor space.”* The Policy's reasoned justification indicates that *“the property should be of an adequate size for the proposed use and the layout, range of facilities and external amenity space should ensure an adequate standard of residential amenity for future occupiers. One step in achieving an adequate standard of accommodation is to ensure that there is adequate living space which complies with nationally Described Space Standards set out in national policy.”*

The DCLG's publication 'Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard' (March 2015) indicates that a 1-bedroom dwelling (even if it will accommodate just one person and with a shower-room rather than a bathroom) should have a gross internal floor area of at least 38m² (37m² + 1m² built-in storage).

Measurements taken from Drawing 196/104 Revision A show that:

- the more westerly ground-floor flat will have a gross internal floorspace of approximately 33m² (i.e. 13% below the standard);
- the more easterly ground-floor flat will total approximately 39m² (meeting the standard);
- the first-floor flat will total approximately 37.5m² (i.e. 1% below the standard); and
- the second-floor flat will total approximately 34m² (i.e. 10% below the standard).

Thus, the proposals do not meet the specific requirements of Policy 21's last sentence and reasoned justification. This weighs against them, even though one of the proposed flats meets the nationally described space standards, and another almost meets them – i.e. only two fall meaningfully short. On the other hand, it is considered that:

- the proposed bedsit flats will provide their occupants with a better standard of residential accommodation and residential amenity than the existing arrangement as a 6-bed HMO; and
- the scale of the floorspace shortfalls are relatively modest.

Furthermore, it is noted that:

- Boston Borough Council's Housing Standards department indicates that it has no objections to the proposals; and
- the occupant of the more westerly ground-floor flat (which falls furthest short of the standards) will have access to the rear garden space via a doorway from their kitchen.

Taking account of the above, it is considered that (although two of the flats do not meet the nationally described space standards and do not therefore meet the requirements of Policy 21's final sentence and reasoned justification), the proposal:

- will nonetheless provide enhanced standards of residential accommodation and residential amenity; and
- (when taken as a whole) will provide an adequate standard of residential accommodation and residential amenity for future occupiers, and will therefore meet the requirements of criterion 7 of Policy 21.

Although it is acknowledged that the proposals do not meet **all** of Policy 21's requirements concerning standards of residential accommodation and residential amenity, it is considered that the above issues mean that a refusal based upon these factors would be unlikely to be supported at appeal.

Provision for communal gardens/amenity areas

Criterion 8 of Policy 21 identifies that a proposal for the sub-division of dwellings will be permitted provided "*adequate provision is made for the communal gardens and amenity areas.*" The Policy's reasoned justification provides no further interpretation, but it assumed that the criterion seeks to ensure that gardens/amenity areas will be satisfactorily maintained.

Neither the application form/drawings nor the documents which accompany the application give an indication of how no.2's garden areas will be maintained. However, at the site visit, it was noted that the property has an enclosed rear yard which cannot be seen from any public vantage point, and that it has a small front yard (which is predominantly paved but also contains a few shrubs) which is largely used for wheelie bin storage. The proposals effectively involve the extension of the front garden by the replacement of the current low wall with a longer length of railings, and appear to involve the removal of the existing shrubs. It is considered that the resulting front yard will potentially be without any requirement for maintenance and that the rear yard has no implications for local amenity.

In these circumstances, it is considered that the proposals meet the requirements of criterion 8 of Policy 21.

Flood risk

Policy 4 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that new development is not unnecessarily exposed to flood risk, and does not increase flood risk elsewhere.

The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) dated February 2021 Version 1 which identifies potential sources and likely severity of flooding, and indicates that:

- the ground-floor of the building is above the Haven flood level which is regulated to a maximum level of 5.3m ODN by the Boston Flood Barrier; and
- there is no increase in flood risk to others;
- the proposal will not increase the number of bedrooms located on the ground-floor; and
- water, electricity and gas meters should be located above the predicted flood level, electrical sockets, heating systems, boiler units and ancillary devices should be installed at least 500mm above ground-floor level, and electric ring mains should be installed at first-floor level with drops to ground-floor sockets and switches.

Subject to a condition requiring the development to comply with the FRA's findings, it is considered that the proposals meet the requirements of Policy 4 – a view that is shared by the Environment Agency.

CONCLUSION:

The proposal:

- will not result in the loss of a family-sized dwelling in a high density residential street;
- will not adversely impact on the amenity of neighbouring land users;
- will not adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the area or upon other heritage assets;
- includes adequate provision for the storage and disposal of refuse and recycling;
- will have good access (by walking and cycling) to community facilities, services, public transport and local employment;
- includes adequate provision for communal gardens/amenity areas;
- is acceptable in flood risk terms (subject to a condition); and
- meets the requirements of the relevant Policies of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036.

The proposal does not strictly accord with the Local Plan's requirements in two respects, and these weigh against it. These issues are:

- whether the proposal includes on-site car parking to meet defined minimum standards (as required by Policy 36). Although the proposal includes no car parking, it is considered that it will have no harmful effects through an increase in on-street parking, impaired highway safety or by impeding proper access to the area; and
- whether the proposal complies with nationally Described Space Standards set out in national policy (as required by Policy 21). Although the proposal does not entirely meet these standards, it is nonetheless considered that it will provide superior residential accommodation than the current HMO arrangements and that (when taken as a whole) the proposal will provide an adequate standard of residential accommodation and residential amenity for future occupiers.

On balance. It is considered that the proposal is in accordance with the Policies of the development plan when taken as a whole. Where any minor conflicts with the Plan or minor material harm occur, these negatives would be outweighed by other material planning considerations. It is therefore considered appropriate for planning permission to be granted.

RECOMMENDATION:

GRANT Planning Permission subject to the following conditions and reasons:-

CONDITIONS / REASONS			
Pre-commencement conditions?		Agreed with applicant/agent - Date:	
1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of four years from the date of this permission.			
Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 51 of the Planning and			

Compulsory Purchase act 2004.
<p>2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the application received on 18-Dec-2020 and in accordance with the associated plans referenced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dwg. No. 196-001: Site Location Plan; • Dwg. No. 196-103 Revision B: Proposed External Elevations; and • Dwg. No. 196-104 Revision A: Proposed Floor Plans. <p>Reason: To ensure the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved details and to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 21, 29, and 30 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036.</p>
<p>3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), RM Associates February 2021 V1, and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • finished floor levels to be set as existing at 5.5m above Ordnance Datum (AOD); and • flood resilience and resistance measures to be incorporated into the proposed development as stated. <p>The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently remain in place.</p> <p>Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants, and to accord with the requirements of Policy 4 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036.</p>

<p>INFORMATIVES / NOTES TO BE INCLUDED ON/WITH DECISION NOTICE</p>
<p><u>STATEMENT OF PROACTIVE WORKING:</u> In determining this application, the authority has taken account of the guidance in paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 in order to seek to secure sustainable development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the Borough.</p>
<p>The Witham Fourth District Internal Drainage Board asks to be informed if there are any changes to the stated arrangement for the disposal of surface water or treated water.</p>
<p>Boston Borough Council's Housing Standards department indicates that the conversion should be carried out with building regulation compliance so fire detection and separation will be to an acceptable level.</p>