DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H02-1220-21**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs G Willcox**
Proposal:	Demolition of existing rear extension, erection of new single storey rear extension, internal alterations, repairs/replacement of windows and roof covering and detached garage.		
Location:	38 South Street Crowland Peterborough		
Terminal Date:	21st January 2022		

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
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
IAN MARSHMAN, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This Listed Building Consent application is for the erection of a single storey rear extension and detached single garage to the rear of 28 South Street, Crowland.

The proposed extension is to be 4.95m (D) x 6.29m (W) in dimensions, featuring a mixed pitched and flat, parapet roof. Windows to feature on the Eastern and Northern elevations, as well as clay pantiles on the pitch, matching the historic extension this application seeks to replace.

The proposed single garage would be of 4.49m (W) x 6.515m (D) with a clay pantile roof and brickwork matching the remainder of the property.

Works to the main house include the retiling of the roof with Collyweston imitation slate tiles and the repair and replacement (like for like) of windows throughout the property.

Site Description

38 South Street is a part of a 2-property grade II listed block. The Historic England listing description is as follows;

"*House, now 2 houses. C17, mid C18, mid C19, C20. Red brick some limestone rubble. Collyweston tiled roof raised in mid C19 with brick coped gables and 2 ridge stacks. 2 storeys and attic, 6 bay front built on C17 rubble foundations. 2 central doorways with overlights and C20 doors. 2 plain sashes beyond on each side. 4 plain sashes above with single blocked opening over doorways. Large central gabled dormer with a pair of plain sashes.*"

The property also sits within the conservation area for Crowland, and is within visual range of the grounds of the Grade I listed Crowland Abbey.

History

None relevant.

Consultation Responses

South Holland IDB

No objections

Crowland Parish Council

Believes this will enhance the historic building

Planning Considerations

Heritage Impact

The Local Planning Authority does not consider there to be a negative impact upon the listed property proposed by this application. The maintenance processes proposed within this application are in desperate need - the Collyweston roof is in a particularly bad condition with clear evidence of tile decay and buckling of the surface. Whilst the loss of genuine Collyweston tiles is of course regrettable, the roof in this instance appears to be in an advanced state of disrepair and it is acknowledged that Collyweston limestone slates are no longer readily available and as such imitation units, as opposed to genuine stock is an acceptable compromise. Similarly to the slates, the extant windows appear to all be in a poor state, and as such, splicing repair as well as some like-for-like replacement is seen as a positive to restore the quality of the site.

The proposed rear extension would take the place of the extremely poor extant rear extension. The extant extension appears to have been built as a direct replacement for a more historic (albeit still non-original structure), which still partially exists in the grounds of the neighbouring property. It currently makes use of inappropriate modern style brick, as well as UPVC windows and rainwater goods. The proposed replacement is a somewhat simple design, however, it does match the form of the extension of the neighbouring, conjoined property and presents an opportunity to correct and improve upon the inappropriate extant structure. Particularly through the removal of unmatched brickwork as well as UPVC accoutrements. The use of a parapet flat roof, as well as stone coping is

appreciated, as is the use of Clay pantiles at the single-storey level in contrast to the slate roof of the host building, as upon inspection of the neighbouring property, this appears to have historically been the standard at this site, and is commensurate with historic building materials for ancillary or subservient structures. Additional windows and doors will be timber, and this will be confirmed via a pre-installation condition.

The proposed single-garage is of a fairly unremarkable style, however, the use of traditional or matching materials in addition to its isolation from the main property mean it will have very little impact upon public appreciation of the host property.

Due to the above, by restoring proper materials to the extension portion of the property and using the accepted compromise for the Collyweston slates, this proposal is found to assist in the upkeep of material standards and therefore in the preservation of the historic environment in accordance with Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

Residential Amenity

The proposed extension, and garage are both single storey in nature and situated with good distance between themselves and any nearby non-attached properties and therefore, cannot be said to bear any risk of overshadowing. The only additional windows presented by this application are east and north facing and at ground floor level, meaning they direct only onto public land and land owned by the property itself, and as such, no risk of overlooking is found.

Parking Provision

The erection of the single garage is on top of some of the extant driveway, however, it is simply the replacement of a single car parking space with a covered, enclosed equivalent. Therefore, the parking provision for this site is not altered by this proposal.

Conclusion

For the reasons listed above, this application is found to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 3, 29, 36 and Appendix 6 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) as well as Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). Therefore, this application 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.