

DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING
--

Application No:	H07-0618-23	Applicant:	Mr B Cobb
Proposal:	Replacement Single Storey Extension & Alterations		
Location:	Mill House Mill Lane Gedney Hill		
Terminal Date:	14th September 2023		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

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**

Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
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
SOUTH HOLLAND INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

Proposal is for a single-storey side extension, a first-floor extension, and alterations to Mill House, Gedney Hill. An associated bakery would be demolished as part of the extension. The alterations would see the creation of an additional bedroom, taking the total to six.

The roof of the storeroom on the west of the property would be raised by approximately 700mm. The roof design would then be incorporated into the new, hipped roof of the main dwelling. The main dwelling would be extended on the first floor, to incorporate the area between the dwelling and the existing bakery. Within these alterations to the storeroom is a Juliet balcony. Three skylights are proposed facing south.

It is proposed that the bakery, attached to the dwelling's east, would be demolished, and replaced with a single-storey side extension. This extension would measure 6175mm (width) by 7378mm (depth). The extension would measure 2600mm to the eaves, with a peak height of 5400mm. Three skylights are proposed facing south.

The existing bakery and storeroom are constructed of red-brown bricks, with clay pantiles. This is in contrast to the main dwelling which is covered in a light stone coloured render. The property features white, UPVC window frames. It is proposed that all materials will match those existing, with the replacement side extension being constructed out of the same materials as the bakery.

Site Description

The site is within the settlement boundaries of Gedney Hill, as outlined within the South-East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 (SELLP). The site is adjacent to a Grade II listed mill, with which the property shares an access point. The two are therefore closely linked.

The locale sees a mixture of uses. To the north and east of the site is agricultural nurseries. The south and west are dominated by residential uses. There is a general preference for larger plots and dwellings in the area.

Relevant History

No relevant history.

Consultation Responses

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the initial consultation exercises, which can be viewed in their entirety through the South Holland website, can be summarised as follows:

Historic Places Team Lincolnshire County Council

Received 03/08/23 - Recommends that a decision is referred until a heritage impact assessment is submitted.

Received 07/09/23 - The report has demonstrated some of the significant development of the group of buildings and although it is missing a few details which would have been useful in establishing the full impact on the historic fabric, I believe there is sufficient information to offer further recommendations.

Notwithstanding any comments from the conservation officer, I have no objections to the proposals in principle. Should permission be granted though, I recommend that a full photographic record of the fabric affected should be undertaken and submitted to the local authority for approval prior to any work commencing.

Conservation Officer

Received 13/9/23 - I write to confirm that I have no objections to this proposal from a Built Heritage Conservation Perspective. Whilst the site is within extremely close range to the Grade II listed mill, the proposal doesn't seek to encroach any further or increase the upward scale of the existing structures, and as such, It cannot be argued that the proposal would have a negative impact upon the appreciation of the mill. However, whilst the former bakery building on site is not considered to be of any particular aesthetic value, and so it's loss is not considered to be of harm to any associated asset, it does have a historic and community value and as such, I mirror the comments of my colleague from the County Council Historic Environment Record and as such additionally request that a photographic building recording take place, prior to commencement of the development. I am happy to defer to the customised wording of this condition outlined by my colleague from the County Council, as this satisfies my considerations. As such, the officer should continue to consider the application in accordance with Policy 29 of the SELLP and Section 16 of the NPPF, in addition to all other relevant planning policy and guidance considerations.

Public Representations

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, no letters of representation have been received.

Evaluation

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The adopted SELLP, is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, 2023 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Planning Considerations

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

Section 12 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", states that " creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve" and as such, it is generally accepted that good design plays a key role towards sustainable development.

Paragraph 130, contained within Section 12 of the NPPF, states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area (including beyond the short term) and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. This goes on to establish that it is important that new development should be of the highest quality, to enhance and reinforce good design characteristics, and that decisions must have regard towards the impact that the proposed development would have on local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting such as topography, street patterns, building lines, boundary treatment and through scale and massing. Developments create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, among other considerations.

Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP outlines sustainable development considerations for proposals; providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals. Furthermore, Policy 3 of the SELLP requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

These policies accord with the provisions of the NPPF and require that 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. Proposals for new development would therefore require the aforementioned considerations to be adequately assessed and designed, including the siting, design, and scale to be respectful of surrounding development and ensure that the character

of the area is not compromised.

The site is extremely prominent within the street scene, partly due to its unique design. As such any alterations would have a significant impact upon the character of the area. That being said, the proposal would bring the dwelling more in keeping with the historic built form of the site. The existing bakery, while visually striking, is out of keeping with the rural character of the area; therefore, its replacement would represent an improvement.

While the scale of the proposed development is large, it would represent a decrease in scale to what is already present. The scale of the proposal would therefore be well proportioned to the existing dwelling and would not appear excessive in size.

The proposed alterations to the roof design would, again, create greater visual constancy with the wider area. The first-floor extension would remove a visual outlier within the area and create a greater aesthetic harmony. While the design would be less unique, it would be more in keeping with the character of the area.

All materials would match the existing property. This would ensure that the unique use of materials on the site would be maintained and ensure the extensions appear well-blended into the fabric of the dwelling.

It is considered that the proposal would be in keeping with the prevailing character of the area. As such, the proposal conforms to Policy 2 and 3 of the SELLP and Section 12 of the NPPF in terms of design and scale.

Impacts Upon Resident Amenity

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF amongst other matters, seeks places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP set out residential amenity and relationship to existing development and land uses as main considerations when making planning decisions.

There are no neighbouring properties to the west of the site. As such, the increase in roof height would create no additional overshadowing. Furthermore, due to this lack of neighbours, the Juliette Balcony would not overlook any dwellings.

The works to the east would see an overall decrease in scale. As such, the potential for overlooking or overshadowing is reduced. The potential amenity impacts are reduced further by the significant distances between residences.

Therefore, the proposed alterations and extensions would not have any impact upon residential amenity. The proposal conforms to Policies 2 and 3 of the SELLP in terms of amenity impacts.

Highway Safety and Parking

Section 9 of the NPPF is titled 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Within this, Paragraph 111 advises that "development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe".

In respect of highway matters, Policy 2 details that proposals requiring planning permission for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to access and vehicle generation. Policy 3 details that development proposals will demonstrate how accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways will be secured, where they are relevant to the proposal.

Policy 36 of the SELLP, in conjunction with Appendix 6, sets out minimum vehicle parking standards and requires at least two spaces for dwellings of up to three bedrooms and three spaces for dwellings with four or more bedrooms.

No changes to the existing access are proposed. As such, the proposal would not increase the impact upon highway safety.

A further parking space would be required due to the increase in bedrooms. The site could accommodate this additional vehicle comfortably.

The proposal would therefore be acceptable and would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety in accordance with Policies 2, 3, and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Section 9 of the NPPF.

Heritage and Conservation

Policy 29 of the SELLP requires all developments in the vicinity of listed buildings to preserve or enhance the setting of the listed building. Section 16 of the NPPF reinforces the need to preserve or enhance the setting of historical assets. As the proposal displays a clear relationship with the Grade II listed mill adjacent, both policies are relevant. A Heritage Impact Assessment has been submitted to support this application.

The proposal would bring the property more in line with the original built form of the site. The replacement of the existing white UPVC with Georgian style sash windows would restore aspects of the original Mill House. The demolition of the derelict bakery would bring the dwelling more in line with the original appearance of the site. The proposal would result in the improvement of worn materials, again further enhancing the appearance of the property. As such, it is considered that the proposal would enhance the setting of the mill.

Following the submission of a heritage impact assessment, the relevant consultee stated from the Historic Places Team raised no objections in principle to the proposal, subject to the completion of a full photographic building recording of the buildings affected.

Planning Balance

As detailed above, Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposal represents appropriate development within the defined settlement boundary. The development hereby proposed does not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality or any heritage assets. The works would not result in harm to the amenity of nearby residents. Sufficient parking is provided.

Conclusion

Taking these factors into consideration, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 2, 3, 29 and 36 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 9, 12, and 16 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the benefits of the proposal; therefore, the planning balance is in favour of the proposal.

The recommendation is for delegated 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.