DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H06-0260-20**	**Applicant:**	**Miss P Clare**
Proposal:	Details of Condition 3 (parts i ii,iii,iv,v and viii) of H06-0714-13)		
Location:	Manor House Broadgate Gedney		
Terminal Date:	26th August 2020		

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

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This proposal seeks to retrospectively discharge parts i, ii, iii, iv, v and viii of Condition 3 of application H06-0714-13.

The relevant part of the condition is described in the following manner:

"Notwithstanding the approved drawings, large scale details (at a scale of at least 1:10) of the following features shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and no further work (other than necessary exploratory opening up works) shall be carried out in advance of that approval. These details shall provide for a cross sectional detailed drawing at 1:10 scale for each feature (where appropriate) and the development shall be constructed in accordance with the details so approved:

i) Replacement fireplace and surround to Drawing Room G3.

ii) Replacement fireplace and surround to Parlour G9.
iii) Alteration of chimney breast and flue to Kitchen G10.
iv) Reinstatement of high level ceiling to Kitchen G10.
v) New high level ceiling to Family Room G12.
viii) Repairs and replacement chimney pots to chimney stacks..."

As the applicant has already carried out these works without seeking the above written consent prior, it has not been possible to obtain sufficient detailed drawings, however, as much of the work is completed, photographic evidence, in some cases supported by less detailed drawings is deemed to be sufficient.

The applicant has submitted evidence of the following work related to each part of Condition 3:

-i) A catalogue image of the proposed fireplace surround unit.
-ii) Before and after images plus rough plans of works to Parlour Fireplace. These show that the upper supporting lintel has been replaced and that the fireplace has been repointed, and in some places has been rebricked with a herringbone pattern.
-iii)Before and after images plus rough plans of works to Kitchen Fireplace. These show that the level of the fireplace has been slightly raised in order to allow space for a range cooker and that the entire fireplace plus chimney breast has been rendered in cream.
-iv) Before and after images show that the high level ceiling in the kitchen has been reinstated, using lime plaster and painted in matching cream.
-v) Before and after images show that the high level ceiling in the family room has been reinstated, using lime plaster and painted in matching cream.
viii) The applicant has sourced a clay replacement chimney pot and has provided imagery of this.

Site Description

Manor House is a Mid C18 farm house, listed to a grade II level. The building is characterised by the dentil courses at both roof and first floor levels, as well as largely by its distinctive porch way and period-looking features (sliding sash, Georgian style windows and 3 gabled dormers etc.). On the curtilage of the building, there also exists a stable block which is itself grade II listed in its own right. Additionally, to the immediate south of the property, there is a larger stable block, which is currently unused and derelict - This building is not listed, however, it is historic and is worthy of note. Indeed, under a 2017 application on the site, the Historic Environment Record requested that this property be recorded, however, this application has not yet been actioned, meaning the recording process has not yet been undertaken. There are no other listed buildings or heritage assets within a reasonable distance or eyeshot of the site.

The site sits in open countryside and is characterised by large open fields, broken by the occasional agricultural building and C19 - early C20 farmhouses.

History

H06-1036-12

Repairs and works to barns in grounds of Grade II listed Building (Retrospective). APPROVED on 29/01/13.

H06-0464-13

Details of a written schedule of all existing door and window openings (Condition 3 of H06-1036-12). APPROVED on 18/07/13.

H06-0713-13

Repair, alterations and refurbishment of the farmhouse and stable building (retrospective). APPROVED on 19/11/13.

H06-0714-13

Repair, alterations and refurbishment of the farmhouse and stable building (retrospective). APPROVED on 19/11/13.

H06-0790-13

Proposed repairs to the east barn (Barn No.4). APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

H06-0801-19

Internal and external works. APPROVED on 21/10/2019

H06-1110-19

Details of window frames (Condition 4 of H06-0801-19). Approved on 25/11/2019

Consultation Responses

None received.

Planning Considerations

Heritage Impact

Due to the retrospective nature of this application it is considered that some of the works that have taken place in the absence of the correct written consent are damaging to the overall internal character of the property. This particularly applies to the restorative works that have been carried out to the Parlour fireplace, which have almost entirely altered the rustic, vernacular character of the opening with the inclusion of a herringbone brick back and what appears to be a modern mantel and a very rough, poor quality finish on the new course lining the opening. Other works to the property and works that are further proposed by this application, seem to far more appropriate to the character of the property. Below, i shall address each part of the condition in isolation;

-i) The proposed new fireplace surround included in the images appears to be timber in construction and of a style which appears appropriate to the historic nature of the site, therefore, it is deemed that this part may be discharged.
-ii) As above, the works carried out to the parlour fireplace appear to be particularly poor. However, given the circumstances and the fact that the fireplace's original character remains somewhat readable, it is considered not appropriate to refuse this application on those grounds, requiring the applicant to reverse the work. Given the nature of the works, the key concern is that requiring the applicant to reverse these works would actually cause further harm, rather than good to the building.
-iii) The works to the kitchen fireplace appear to be high quality and fully appropriate to the nature of the building. Minimal structural work has been carried out, although the arch has been raised to allow a range cooker installation and the whole structure has been rendered in cream. The raising of the arch is deemed appropriate as it has a minimal impact upon the character and also allows for continued modern use.
-iv and v) The high ceilings in the kitchen and family room have been reinstated using lime plaster. This work is restorative and brings back the original character of these rooms. The materials are appropriate and so is the design.
-viii) The chimney pot that has been sourced appears to be made of clay and is of a fairly typical Georgian style and is therefore deemed to be appropriate.

As a result of the fact that some works have had a damaging effect upon this property, it is not possible to claim that this application helps to enhance the historic environment, however, the remainder of the work seems to have been carried out in a thoughtful, appropriate and high quality manner, all of which help to restore this derelict property and allow its modern use, helping to preserve this property well into the future. For this reason, it is considered that this application helps to conserve the Historic Environment in line with the guidance of Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Conclusion

For the reasons listed above, it is determined that the application is in accordance with policies 1, 2, 3 and 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019), as well as Sections 12 and 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 xxx 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 xxx 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.