

## DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

**Application No:** H11-0753-19      **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Walklin

**Proposal:** Remove chimney stack, replace beams supporting ground floor (to allow increased floor to ceiling height in basement), alteration to existing window openings, replacement of windows, demolish single-storey rear extension and erect new single-storey rear extension

**Location:** 22 Market Street Long Sutton Spalding

**Terminal Date:** 30th October 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  |

#### 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,<br>HISTORIC<br>ENVIRONMENT OFFICER | 0      | 0       | 0       | 1        |

### CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

**Proposal**

This Listed Building Consent application proposes that the extant chimney stack be removed, the ground floor supporting beams to be replaced to allow for reasonable headspace in the basement, replacement and/or alteration of existing windows and window openings. In addition, it is proposed that an ensuite to be created in the first floor bedroom, which would require the creation of a new internal wall, as well as minor amendment to the original skirting and the dry lining of an original built-in wardrobe. Finally, it is proposed that the existing 1960s rear extension be demolished, to be replaced with a larger kitchen extension.

The demolition of the chimney stack is proposed as a result of its current precarious structural condition. Upon inspection, it is clear that the existent chimney stack is leaning to a concerning degree and interior examination reveals that it is almost completely free-standing with no support. It is proposed that the roof would be made good with appropriate tiling and a lime mortar verge.

The adjustments to the basement ceiling will represent a fairly major works to the internals of the property. However, they shouldn't present much in the way of amendment to the character or appearance in the building other than that the ceiling will be 15cm higher in the basement, this is proposed so that the basement may reasonably be used as regular living space, as the current ceiling height is interrupted by the large beams, which are well within a reasonably expected head height. The proposal is for the outright removal of the current exposed timber beams to be replaced with steel purlins in the existing cavity between the ceiling of the basement and the floor of the ground floor living room.

The existing UPVC basement, ground floor and mezzanine/half-landing windows to the rear of the property are to be replaced with new, timber painted casement windows. The opening for the rear ground floor window to be reduced in size to the original scale, as a previous occupant has enlarged the opening without permission. The front basement window is currently a metal-frame casement window. It is proposed that this be replaced with a painted timber sliding sash style window and the extant concrete lintel shall be replaced with a Brick Soldier Course.

The creation of an en-suite bathroom in the 1st floor master bedroom would require the creation of a new internal wall in order to enclose the proposed room, in addition, small amounts of removal of original skirting board will be required in order to redirect the appropriate plumbing. The area it is proposed will be taken by the en-suite does feature an original built-in wardrobe, in order to create a practical bathroom, it is required that this area be 'squared off'. As a result, the applicant proposes boarding up/dry-lining the wardrobe so that it is removed as a feature from the wall. However, using this method, the wardrobe will remain in-situ and undamaged, simply hidden behind a false wall. It is suggested that this would be reversible in the event that any future occupant wishes to expose the original feature.

The demolition and replacement of the existing rearwards extension is proposed as it is unsightly and also in a very poor state of repair. The proposals for replacement are for a 6.341m x 4.022m extension, featuring a cut out on the West side of the structure of 0.8m to accommodate for the basement window. This will effectively create an extension which is roughly 'L' shaped in design, a small access path to the area in front of the basement window will be created along the North Western elevation of the proposed between the proposed and the rear extension of number 24. Following amendment of the plans, it is proposed that the extension will feature a dual pitched roof inclusive of 6 roof lights (3 on either pitch), timber painted casement windows with soldier course and will be serviced by cast iron guttering. Incidental to the extension is that it has been brought to the attention of the applicant that the current original boundary wall (which the current extension utilises as its Eastern wall) has no foundations and is also in a poor state. As part of the demolition, the applicant proposes to demolish this wall, and rebuild it like-for-like using recycled and matching materials, including mortar.

## **Site Description**

The property is one of 4 houses on the Grade II listed 22-28 Market House building. The building at large was constructed in roughly 1820 and features several modern C20 features. The standout character feature of the building is the large central carriage archway with basket arch. The specific property, number 22, is one of the end-of-terrace properties of the building. from the road It is in a noticeably worse condition than the rest of the houses in the terrace, as it appears the property has not been looked after in the years proceeding this time. The windows appear damaged and rotten and the chimney stack (which does not appear original as it matches no other stacks on the building in either design or location) is leaning at an alarming angle. The rear of the property is much the same, the windows are rotten and a mid-C20 extension has been rather crudely constructed

projecting from the Eastern side of the rear of the property. This extension is now in an extremely poor state of repair and is of considerable damage to the qualities of the listing. Several points of the property have brickwork/pointing in an advanced state of disrepair and the rear has been rendered with a thick, cream coloured render.

In addition, the site also sits in a highly prominent portion of the Long Sutton Conservation Area (LSCA). Market Street forms the main entrance into the village centre and the site is positioned nearly right at the primary (eastern) end of this street, meaning it is positioned very nearly within the village centre, and, indeed, can almost be seen from the village's central crossroads upon which sits the characterful Bull Hotel (Grade II listed). The property is within close proximity to several other Grade II listed buildings.

## **History**

None relevant

## **Consultation Responses**

### Lincolnshire County Council Historic Environment Officer

The originally submitted Heritage Impact Assessment was lacking in appropriate detail and was not sufficient for the Case Officer to make an informed determination. Requested the applicant be required to issue a new, more considered document.

The applicant submitted a new HIA at the request of the Case Officer, after which the Historic Environment Officer provided updated comments, which were as follows:

The amended HIA is far more acceptable and provides suitable details for the case officer. The proposed chimney demolition is acceptable as it is not original and damages the symmetry of the terrace.

The basement window proposal is acceptable, a sash window is far more in keeping with the property than the existing metal frame casements.

Raising the ceiling height of the basement would be acceptable, provided that the historic floor surfaces will be unharmed, any fireplaces wouldn't require moving and the characterful height in the ground floor living room won't be significantly impacted upon.

With regards to the proposed rearward extension, it is felt that the proposed was inappropriate in design, being flat-roofed it gave the appearance of being very similar to the unappealing 1960s extension it proposed to replace and appears to be a waste of an opportunity to incorporate the original boundary wall which could have been heightened to hide the extension from roadside views.

## **Planning Considerations**

### Heritage Impact

It is considered that although the proposals do consist of fairly major structural works, the finished product will be a set of works which will not have a significant negative impact upon the current listing or character of the property. This is for the following reasons;

The demolition of the chimney stack is proposed as a result of its current precarious structural condition. Upon inspection, it is clear that the existent chimney stack is leaning to a concerning degree and interior examination reveals that it is almost completely free-standing with no support. It is proposed that the roof would be made good with appropriate tiling and a lime mortar verge. In addition to preserving the structural safety of the building, it is suggested that the removal of this chimney will actually enhance the character as it is poorly constructed using unsightly methods and is not original or matching to the building, meaning its presence damages the symmetrical design that the terrace would originally have had.

The adjustments to the basement ceiling will represent a fairly major works to the internals of the property. However, they shouldn't present much in the way of amendment to the character or appearance in the building other than that the ceiling will be 15cm higher in the basement by virtue

of the removal of the beams. Whilst these beams do seem to be original to the building, they are not decorative and are simply exposed. Removing these will bring the basement into a reasonable liveable condition without increasing the basement's vulnerability to flooding or impacting upon any characterful elements in the room above.

The various works to windows are deemed to be wholly appropriate to the building. A previous occupant had installed UPVC windows without permission and had altered the size of the rear ground-floor window opening. The proposals are for the installation of various timber, painted sliding sash and casement windows which are considered to be far more appropriate to the building. It is also proposed that the front basement concrete lintel be replaced with a far more period-appropriate soldier course and that the rear ground floor window opening be restored to the original, smaller size.

The creation of an en-suite bathroom in the 1st floor master bedroom would require the creation of a new internal wall in order to create a small enclosure for the proposed room. This work shouldn't cause major damage to the building and will not impact upon any significant characterful features. In addition, small amounts of removal of original skirting board will be required in order to redirect the appropriate plumbing. Whilst the Planning Authority regrets the loss of a portion of an original feature, the work is deemed to be minor enough to not present a risk to the character of the interior of the property. The proposal to board up the built in wardrobe will mean that the wardrobe will remain in-situ and undamaged, simply hidden behind a false wall. It is suggested that this would be reversible in the event that any future occupant wishes to expose the original feature.

The existing rear extension is an eyesore and was erected during the 1960s without any form of permission, and in addition, is in a poor state of repair. The applicant's proposal to remove this structure will be a welcome amendment to the character of the rear face of 22-28 Market Street. However, the extension does utilise the original boundary wall as its eastern elevation. The boundary wall is without foundation and is, itself in a poor state and so it is proposed that it be demolished and rebuilt like-for-like in a more structurally robust manner, using recycled or matching materials wherever possible. The replacement extension will be more sympathetic in design. Utilising timber framed windows, a dual pitched roof and cast-iron rainwater goods as well as matching brickwork - it shall appear far more handsome and appropriate to the area than what currently exists on the site.

Ultimately, the view of the building from the roadside, within the Long Sutton Conservation Area should be much improved by these proposals, the replacement front basement window and the removal of the out-of-place chimney will go a long way to restoring the image of 22 Market Street to that of the originally indented design and should uplift the terrace as a whole, which is being let down by number 22's condition. Whilst the rear extension will be visible from the street, the view will be minimal and should not impact upon the overall character at all.

For the reasons listed above it is considered that the proposals both CONSERVE and ENHANCE the significance of the listing and that of the Long Sutton Conservation Area at large. It therefore must be considered to be in accordance with policy 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019)

### Design and Layout

The Local Planning Authority seeks no amendment to the design or layout of the proposals. The proposed extension is considered to be sympathetic and appropriate to service its proposed use as a kitchen. The proposed en-suite does impact upon the original layout of the property, but it is suggested that the change will be minor enough to not significantly impact upon the overall use and character of the property.

### Residential Amenity

It is considered that the proposals present no risk to the residential amenity of either neighbours or the inhabitants of 22 Market Street. This is because the proposals do not present an overlooking risk as there are no new proposed window openings. Additionally, the proposals do not suggest any overlooking risk as the extension element of the proposed will be only single-storey in height.

### **Conclusion**

For the reasons listed above, it is felt that the proposals are in accordance with policies 1, 2, 3 and

29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). This application is therefore 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.