DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H04-1095-20**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs K Grant**
Proposal:	Proposed 2 storey extension & alterations, convert and alter existing outbuilding/carport into carport/office & games room		
Location:	Crossgate Farm House 58 Quadring Road Donington		
Terminal Date:	1st February 2021		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

12 - Achieving well-designed places

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	1	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a full application for a proposed 2 storey extension & alterations, convert and alter existing outbuilding/carport into carport/office & games room at Crossgate Farm House, 58 Quadring Road, Donington. The proposal seeks to provide an office, double carport, games area and wc in a converted barn to the front of the building. The barn measures approx. 14.31 metres in width and 4.94 metres in depth, with an eaves height of 2.6 metres and a ridge height of 4.2 metres. The proposal does not seek to extend the barn or materially alter the external materials of construction.

With regard to the main dwelling, three rooflights are to be installed on the front roof slope. To the rear, a two storey extension is to be sited. At ground level the extension would contain a dining area which connects in an open plan design to a kitchen within the existing dwelling. A log burner will be sited in the south-east corner of the dining room. At first floor level a bedroom, en-suite and wardrobe are to be sited. Large windows are to be sited in the rear elevation of the extension on both floors.

The extension projects 5.045 metres from the original rear wall, is 6.310 metres in width, has an eaves height of 4.8 metres and a ridge height of 7 metres. Proposed tiles are to match the existing dwelling. The base of the elevations is to be constructed from matching brick with black vertical stained timber or a fake alternative to the rear and side elevations of the extensions. The exact timber will be addressed by condition.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The proposal site is outside of defined settlement limits and the surrounding area is predominately rural, characterised by buildings of varying ages and designs. The entirety of the site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 1 and is not subject to increase flood hazard or flood depth on the 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping.

HISTORY

H04-0194-99

Full - Conversion of barns to dwelling and extension - Approved - 12 May 1999.

H04-0744-99

Condition Compliance - Joinery details and landscape planting details (Condition 2 and 3 of H04/0194/99) - Approved - 07 September 1999.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Councillor King

Although this isn't a listed building the intended extension isn't really sympathetic with the rest of the building.

Councillor Walsh

No objections.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

This application is for a residential extension on residential land. The principle of development in this location is considered to be acceptable.

Assessment against SELLP Policy 2 - Development Management

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 2 titled - Development Management. This policy states:

"Proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to:
1. size, scale, layout, density and impact on the amenity, trees, character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development and land uses;
2. quality of design and orientation;
3. maximising the use of sustainable materials and resources;
4. access and vehicle generation levels;
5. the capacity of existing community services and infrastructure;
6. impact upon neighbouring land uses by reason of noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion;
7. sustainable drainage and flood risk;

8. impact or enhancement for areas of natural habitats and historical buildings and heritage assets;
9. impact on the potential loss of sand and gravel mineral resources."

When assessed against the above relevant criteria the following can be observed:

1. The size, scale, layout and density of the proposal is considered to be appropriate for the site. The barn to the front of the site will not be extended, or externally altered on any elevation that is visible to the public. The proposed two storey extension is set to the rear of the dwelling and is not immediately visible to the public. The dwelling is 95 metres away from the closest dwelling. No trees are affected by the proposal, and the location of the works does not impact the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

2. The design and materials of construction of the rear extension are not considered to be in keeping with the existing dwelling. However, the dwelling is not listed, subject to an Article 4 direction, in a conservation area or immediately visible to the public. Bearing this in mind it is not considered to justify a recommendation of refusal for this reason. The orientation is in keeping with standard building extensions.

3. The proposed materials are not sustainable. However, it is not considered that any modern environmentally sustainable external materials of construction would be in keeping with the existing dwelling.

4. The access, vehicle generation levels and parking provision are not negatively impacted by the proposal. The barn to the front will provide two carport places, so the level of off road parking provision has been increased.

5. Existing community services and infrastructure are not impacted by this proposal.

6. There is not considered to be a noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion impact from this proposal. The nearest dwelling is 95 metres away.

7. The entirety of the site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 1 and is not subject to increase flood hazard or flood depth on the 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. Raised floor levels are not required for either development comprising the proposal.

The proposal accords with SELLP Policy 2.

Assessment against SELLP Policy 3 - Design of New Development

This proposal is assessed against SELLP Policy 3 titled - Design of New Development. This policy states:

All development will create distinctive places through the use of high quality and inclusive design and layout and, where appropriate, make innovative use of local traditional styles and materials. 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.
Development proposals will demonstrate how the following issues, where they are relevant to the proposal, will be secured:
1. creating a sense of place by complementing and enhancing designated and non designated heritage assets; historic street patterns; respecting the density, scale, visual closure, landmarks, views, massing of neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area;
2. distinguishing between private and public space;
3. the landscape character of the location;
4. accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways;
5. the provision of facilities for the storage of refuse/recycling bins, storage and/or parking of bicycles and layout of car parking;
6. the lighting of public places;
7. ensuring public spaces are accessible to all;
8. crime prevention and community safety;
9. the orientation of buildings on the site to enable the best use of decentralised and renewable low-carbon energy technologies for the lifetime of the development;
10. the appropriate treatment of facades to public places, including shop frontages to avoid visual intrusion by advertising, other signage, security shutters, meter boxes and other service and

communication infrastructure;
11. residential amenity;
12. the mitigation of flood risk through flood-resistant and flood-resilient design and sustainable drainage systems (SuDS);
13. the use of locally sourced building materials, minimising the use of water and minimising land take, to protect best and most versatile soils;
14. the incorporation of existing hedgerows and trees and the provision of appropriate new landscaping to enhance biodiversity, green infrastructure, flood risk mitigation and urban cooling;
15. the appropriate use or reuse of historic buildings.

When assessed against the above relevant criteria the following can be observed:

1. The proposed barn conversion to the front of the site and two storey extension to the rear of the dwelling are not considered to materially impact a sense of place.

4. The proposal site is outside of defined settlement limits but a short walk away from bus stops in the settlement of Donington to the north.

9. The dwelling is existing, therefore, the extensions cannot be orientated satisfactorily to best enable renewable low-carbon energy technologies.

11. There is not considered to be a noise, odour, disturbance or visual intrusion impact from this proposal. The nearest dwelling is 95 metres away.

12. The entirety of the site is in Environment Agency Flood Zone 1 and is not subject to increase flood hazard or flood depth on the 2115 South Holland Strategic Flood Risk Mapping. Raised floor levels are not required for either development comprising the proposal.

The proposal accords with SELLP Policy 3.

PLANNING BALANCE

Whilst the proposed two storey extension is not entirely in keeping with the existing dwelling, by virtue of it's location to the rear and the distance of 95 metres to the nearest property, there is not considered to be a material impact on the character or amenity of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore accords with Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019, as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

CONCLUSION

The proposal 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.