DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H08-0448-22**	**Applicant:**	**Ms M Firth**
Proposal:	Barn Conversion - approved under H08-0429-20. Modification of Condition 2 to allow amendments to previously approved plans.		
Location:	Hazelwood Grange Hedgefield Hurn Gosberton		
Terminal Date:	25th August 2022		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
23	The Reuse of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use
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
RESIDENTS	1	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This listed building consent application incorporates several design alterations to the original proposal as presented under H08-0428-20. These include;

-Alteration of previously proposed southern 'cart-shed' to remove the previously proposed fascia and cart doors, to instead feature no fascia masking the mono-pitch and a replacement of the cart-door with a simple set of floor to ceiling casement timber windows with a reclaimed oak lintel.

-Alteration to the Northern wing of the listed building to incorporate a higher roof with lead panelled surface, an exaggerated and enlarged east-projecting wing featuring with gable glazing with aluminium frame to replace the garage door, remove the previously agreed weatherboarding, reverted to brick with a traditional tumbled gable.

-reconfiguration of the proposed gable glazing to the east and North of the proposal from oak frame to aluminium powder coated, with fewer glazing sections.

-Alteration of the Southwestern 'cart shed' elevation roof pitch to include a wraparound pitch over to the northwestern elevation.

-Change the windows as proposed under H08-0429-20 throughout to simpler, side-by-side timber casements without glazing bars.

- Wall on the Southern Boundary to be reduced from 4m to 3.3m

-Alteration of the approved garage plans to change the storage shed section from 3-bay to 2-bay, remove the cupola feature from the roof and change the openings in the garage section from having brick arches to flat arches as well as addition of rooflights to the 1st floor height section of the structure and an additional mock hayloft door on the southern elevation.

Site Description

As in host application.

History

As in host application

Consultation Responses

Resident Objection

1 Objection was received from a local resident.

The content of that objection can be summarised like so:

- Reduction of the boundary wall from 4m to 3.3m has been done without consent.
- Applicant has proceeded with wraparound extension to the South and West of the site without consent.
- Previously consented oak large gable glazed window/s were more appropriate to the listed building than the currently proposed aluminium powder coated units
- Eastern projection roof line being raised is a substantial alteration to the originally agreed proposal and cannot be justified as a minor amendment.
- Change from a ground floor window to a glazed door on Northern elevation will alter the look of the development.
- Southern 'cart shed' is being prepared for amalgamation into the Southern Boundary wall
- Applicant has commenced construction of the wraparound south and western elevation extension and this newly amended design substantially increases the floor space - this should warrant a new full application.
- Southern elevation of Eastern projecting wing has changed with alterations to doors and roof orientation.
- Applicant has not yet filled in rear wall of the storage shed section of the garage block
- Alterations to design of garage block warrant an application
- New southern mock hayloft door faces the neighbours and could cause overlooking issues.
- The proposed velux windows were not included within the original approved application.
- Soldier Course brick arch rather than a rounded top arch above the garage door openings is a

substantial alteration and different to that which was approved.

Planning Considerations

Local Resident

An objection was received from a local resident. Much of the objectors comments relate to the fact that the new proposals are simply different in nature, style or dimensions from that which was approved under H08-0429-20. This application is an amendment application in that it seeks to amend several aspects of the design which was approved under that application. It is therefore wholly anticipated that such an application would vary in design to the originally approved case and this application seeks to make lawful the alterations which the applicant seeks to make, therefore, any objection based simply on a difference of design is not a material reason in itself to refuse this application.

The objector made several other points of objection. Those are addressed in order below;

- Reduction of the boundary wall from 4m to 3.3m has been done without consent / Applicant has proceeded with wraparound extension to the South and West of the site without consent.:

The applicant should not proceed with any form of development in accordance with unapproved plans until such a time as the alternative is approved in writing. However, this application seeks to make the alterations lawful.

- Previously consented oak large gable glazed window/s were more appropriate to the listed building than the currently proposed aluminium powder coated units:

The host property to this application is only a structure which is listed due to its association with Panton House at the time of listing. It is not itself mentioned in the listing description and therefore, it can be extremely difficult to ascertain what is considered to be the 'special interest' in this structure. Oak framed windows were seen as a highly positive feature of the proposed development, however, metal alternatives, are not deemed to be unacceptable in the context of this listed-by-association property, as metal windows, particularly with slim mullions, are not considered to be a form which is inappropriate to a historic-environment setting.

- Southern 'cart shed' is being prepared for amalgamation into the Southern Boundary wall:

This would run contrary to the approved and proposed drawings and therefore, if such a development is carried out, this would be unpermitted works. Evidence of this was not observed by the case officer upon the conducting of a site visit. However, should this be conducted, this would be illegal development and this application does not seek to permit that work.

- Applicant has not yet filled in rear wall of the storage shed section of the garage block:

The applicant reiterates their intention to fill in the rear elevation of the storage block with weatherboarding which suggests they intend to continue with this process. Due to the nature of the material intended to fill in this section of wall, this may be left until a later phase of development.

- New southern mock hayloft door faces the neighbours and could cause overlooking issues:

The proposed mock hayloft doors are not functional features and will serve purely aesthetic purposes. They do not create any additional overlooking risk.

- The proposed velux windows were not included within the original approved application:

This application seeks consent for these windows, which face back to the host property, causing no risk of overlooking to any neighbouring property.

Heritage Impact

The Local Planning Authority does not consider this proposal to risk harming the value or significance of any heritage asset. The host property is listed by association to the nearby Panton House and is not listed in its own right and nor is it described in the listing description for Panton

House. What was left following the removal of the damaged and dilapidated corrugated steel exterior shell was the somewhat unremarkable C19th Barn, the shell of which is now being converted into Hazelwood Grange. The proposed alterations to the originally agreed design do not detract from the special interest in the site. Oak Framed windows would have been a preferable alternative. However, metal frames for windows are not incompatible with the historic environment and can most especially be seen as fully appropriate in agricultural or industrial building such as the host property.

The proposed alterations to the standard windows to casement timber windows is supported with photographic evidence which shows that the windows originally situated within the building were matching to the proposed alternative design.

The alterations to the eastward projecting wing to the north of the site represent a design improvement over that which was approved previously. The applicant has been able to show that previously on site a wing of the building which was at the height of the proposed new ridgeline was extant, setting a historic precedent for this scale. Additionally, the tumbled gable and glazed gable-end are a marked visual improvement over the mock-garage style of the previously approved proposal.

The south and western elevation mock car-shed extension is to be retained and simply adds a small further section to the rear of the property, utilising the same design and scale - this does not detract from appreciation of the site from public views and does not impact upon any aspects of the site which could be considered to be a part of the site's special interest.

The garage/storage shed structure is brand new and therefore not considered to be listed in any sense. However, from a conservation perspective, none of the proposed alterations to that structure harm the setting of the heritage asset.

For the reasons set out above, on balance, this proposal is deemed to have a neutral impact upon the heritage asset. The large gable glazing sections would have been preferable in their originally agreed oak format. However, the proposed aluminium alternative is not unacceptable and the other proposed alterations are either minor or actually make improvements to the authenticity and design of the final proposal. For this reason, this application can be said to assist in conserving the Historic Environment in accordance with S16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

Residential Amenity

The local planning authority does not consider this application to negatively impact upon the residential amenity of any nearby residential property when compared to the approved plans. The reduction in height of the southern boundary wall from 4m to 3.3m still leaves a very large boundary wall which would be situated above the south-facing velux windows.

The raised ridgeline of the roof of the east-projecting wing to the north is a minimal alteration in height and situated a sufficient distance away from the southern border to not risk interfering with the east-west trajectory of the sun across the sky and thus should not create an overshadowing effect.

Furthermore, the proposed south facing hay-loft door in the gable of the garage block is only a mock-door used for its aesthetic contributions, it will not be opening and there is not a floorspace from which it can be accessed. It presents no risk of overlooking to the south.

Parking provision

The proposed alterations to the garage block are purely aesthetic and will not impact upon the designated provision for parking. The proposal site retains its 2 bay garage in addition to large driveway and as such the parking provision is not altered by this application.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, this application is deemed 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.