

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H05-0916-19 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Lane
Proposal: Proposed rear part two-storey and part single-storey extension and alterations to dwelling, extension to stables and erection of a detached garage with store over
Location: Mill House Fleet Bank Fleet
Terminal Date: 13th November 2019

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 2019

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
 Section 16 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

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
RESIDENTS	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The proposal is for the construction of a rear extension which is part-two storey and part single-storey. To achieve this, a modern garage will be demolished. The proposals additionally include several amendments to the interior of the property of the listed building, mostly amounting to interior wall demolition, as well as small-scale exterior wall demolition to allow access to the new extension. The extension to the principal property will extend out from the Northern elevation of the main property and will utilise a number of sympathetic design features including cream painted timber chequered dormer windows with timber sliding sash frames. The proposals also include a brick and mortar type which matches as closely the original brickwork as possible. The two storey element of the extension will extend out to roughly half the overall length of the extension, with the single-storey element extending further to the north below. The ground floor is proposed to feature aluminium 'Anthracite Grey' coloured bi-fold doors. This will also include the replacement of the non-original ground floor west-facing casement windows with period appropriate sliding sash units to match with those included with the extension and the rest of the extant property.

In relation to the extension it is also proposed that a small wall be inserted partially in the old building, partially in the new extension. This wall will form a small bathroom and will not include any additional demolition.

In addition, it is proposed that the current, modern timber-framed car port be demolished with a replacement full, brick built double garage to be erected to the immediate south west of the extant car port's position and west of the extant property and its driveway.

Finally, it is proposed that the existing stable block to the North of the property be extended further out from the western elevation. This extension will be formed of two parts - a food storage section featuring timber double barn doors and a roof height to match the existing and to the immediate west of that, an open fronted section for the storage of tractors. This section will have a slightly raised roof. All elements of the stable extension will be timber with slate roof to match the existing structure.

Site Description

Mill House is a Grade II listed farmhouse. The property is out in open countryside, being neighboured by only 2 houses and operational commercial and agricultural units. The property possesses a large amount of land which is primarily used as a paddock for the current residents' horses, which are serviced by the existing stable block. The property also features a modern brick built garage and a timber frame car port.

History

H05-0544-13

Erection of Stables (retrospective). APPROVED on 28/08/13.

H05-0781-13

Details of exterior boarding, roof materials, storage and disposal of waste and foul water drainage (conditions 2, 4, 5 and 6 of H05-0544-13). APPROVED on 24/09/13.

Consultation Responses

Local Residents

Do not wish to object but the applicant should be aware of the nearby airfield which could be a source of distressing noise for any additional horses that may be brought onto the site.

Lincolnshire County Council, Historic Environment Officer

No archaeological input required.

Planning Considerations

Heritage Impact

The proposals do include some demolition of original material, namely interior walls in the kitchen and reception area of the ground floor, creating a small open-plan entrance area to the new extension. Of course, the extension will also require small-scale 'knocking through' of the original external walls on both the ground and 1st floor Northern elevations in order to allow entrance. Whilst the local planning authority regrets the loss of original material, it is accepted that the proposed loss of original walls is small and should not greatly damage the interior character of the property.

In terms of the new material, starting with the proposed rear extension, it is considered that the design of the proposals is of extremely high quality and fits with the original property to an exemplary level. The proposed brick type, mortar type and slate roof tiles are closely matching those which were used on the original property and the proposed dormer windows are in keeping with the design of the extant property and feature appropriate sliding sash style windows. The installation of aluminium bi-fold doors and the inclusion of a small step-down in the roof pitch shall be key nods to the non-original nature of the extension and should separate the two in an effective, yet tasteful manner. The loss of the modern rendered garage unit is not considered to be a negative, this is because it appears to be relatively modern and does not match the rest of the property at all. Its replacement will be much more suitable and its loss should be considered a NET gain to the character of the site.

The demolition of the timber framed car port will not be considered a loss for similar reasons. It is entirely modern and adds nothing in terms of character to the site overall. The construction of a full brick built garage should not cause any harm to the character of the property, this is largely because the proposals suggest use of matching brickwork and roof tiles and traditional timber cladding, which matches that which was used in the car port. The door into the garage will also be traditional timber, painted cream with Georgian sliding sash windows used throughout the structure.

The proposed stable extension also is not considered harmful to the character of the building. The proposals are to be of identical and matching construction and materials to the extant structure and the equestrian use of the site is in keeping with the agricultural heritage of the listed building and the area in general.

For the reasons listed above it is considered that the proposals CONSERVE and ENHANCE the historic environment and therefore must be considered to be in accordance with policy 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Design and Layout

The Local Planning Authority seeks no amendment to the design or layout of the proposals. This is because the overall use of design and materials is deemed highly suitable to the principal property and the immediate area.

The layout of the proposed rear extension, stables extension and garage are deemed to be wholly appropriate to service their intended uses.

Parking Provision

Although the proposals will mean the loss of the 2 car parking spots in the extant car port, these will be replaced by the construction of the proposed double garage. The proposals will, therefore, mean no loss of parking provision

Conclusion

For the reasons listed above the proposals are found to be in accordance with policies 1, 2, 3, 29, 36 and appendix 6 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). 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.