DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H12-1191-19**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs Feather**
Proposal:	Proposed extensions and alterations		
Location:	Cock And Magpie Cottage 18 Gedney Road Long Sutton		
Terminal Date:	5th February 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 - 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
RESIDENTS	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This full planning application is for extensions and alterations to Cock and Magpie Cottage, 18 Gedney Road, Long Sutton. The works include removal of the timber sun room on the western elevation of the property in order to form a kitchen extension, featuring roof lantern, using the same footprint as well as conversion of existing attached outbuilding to additional ground floor living

space. Additionally, an existing timber frame and corrugated steel roof lean-to at the rear of the attached outbuilding is to be demolished and replaced with a flat roof extension, forming a lounge/living room with timber frame bi-fold doors on the northern (rear) elevation. Finally, it is proposed that a single conservation-style roof window be installed on the northern roof pitch of the property.

Site Description

The host building is a grade II listed property which was formerly a public house. The Historic England listing description for the property reads as follows;

"Public house, now cottage and adjoining outbuilding. Late C18, mid C19 and C20 alterations. Red brick. Pantile roof. 2 C20 gable stacks. Brick coped gables. Single storey plus attic, 3 bays. Central doorway with panelled door. Either side are single plain sashes. All openings with wooden lintels. In the attic are 2 dormers each with single glazing bar sash. To the left is the single storey, 3 bay outbuilding. Doorway with plank door, to the right is a single C20 casement with no openings to the left."

The building's rear has been extensively altered over time, so much so that it does not retain the same pleasing qualities of the principal elevation. Whilst not of unique or exceptional architectural value, the building does hold local value as a historic community asset and also as a pleasing and well-preserved example of vernacular style with architectural similarity to Public Houses across the county.

The property sits outside of the Long Sutton Conservation Area (LSCA), however, it is a property which is prominent along one of the main access routes into the town and so can be said to have an impact upon the impression of the character of the town upon approach. The immediate surroundings of the property are purely residential in nature, with a wide mix of both architectural period and style. The property is attached to its neighbour's garage block by means of the single-storey garage. This conjoining wall is not a party wall and is owned solely by No. 16 Gedney Road.

History

None relevant.

Consultation Responses

Local Residents

A local resident has issued an objection to the proposals on the grounds that the wall conjoining the proposal site and No. 16 is not a party wall and therefore works cannot be allowable without the owner of No.16's consent. Additionally, it is suggested that both properties share roofing beams through the conjoining wall and therefore works to these in number 18 could damage the neighbouring property.

Planning Considerations

Residents objections

Whilst the local planning authority recognises the validity of the objector's claim that the wall separating No.'s 18 and 16 is not a party wall and is, in fact, owned by No.16, given that the proposals do not suggest any intrusive or invasive work to be carried out upon that wall, the objector and applicant should note that this is, in effect, a boundary dispute and therefore is a civil matter, the likes of which is not valid a reason to refuse planning permission.

The same response is levied at the concern over shared roof timbers. As no works are proposed to said timbers by this application, and because the timbers undoubtedly become the property of No.18 once they pass through the Eastern, non-party wall, this is not a planning concern and if the owner of No.16 becomes concerned that any works to those timbers in the future will have a negative impact upon their property, they should pursue this as a civil matter.

Heritage Impact

The Local Planning Authority does not consider there to be any negative risk to the significance of

the designated asset in these proposals. Given that the outbuilding is currently used only as a storage structure, it has developed into a poor condition, repurposing this structure will help to bring it back into regular use, therefore saving this significant element of a listed building from entering an advanced state of disrepair. Additionally, the proposed dry-lining of the interior of the outbuilding as well as the introduction of timber stud walls to create a dressing room and en-suite will make the space more suitable to modern use without risking intrusive or invasive works to original fabric and should be fully reversible.

The proposed removal of a portion of wall to the interior front of the property to create an open family/dining room does not completely strip the rooms of reference to the original walls and so the original layout will remain readable. The same applies to all of the proposed opening enlargements throughout the property - non propose complete loss of original layout readability.

The proposed replacement kitchen extension structure at the location of the extant timber 'sun-room' is, again, not detrimental to the character of the property, being far more suitable than the extant, rather unsightly timber structure, with flat roofs being furnished with parapets and timber framed windows.

The rearward extension to form a Lounge, is also acceptable, whilst not of any particular architectural merit, replaces a significantly dilapidated and unsightly timber and corrugated steel lean-to and will be constructed of appropriate brick and feature wide, timber frame bi-fold doors. It's construction would help to bring the property into contemporary use and will contribute significantly to the overall work to 'tidy up' the rear elevation of the property.

For the reasons listed above, it is deemed that the these proposals will PRESERVE and ENHANCE this historic environment.

Design and Layout

The Local Planning Authority seeks no amendment to the design or layout of the proposals. This is because the design, as listed above is acceptable to the listed nature of the structure and the wider historic environment surrounding the property. In addition, the layout of the proposals is deemed appropriate to the wider context of the structure at large and should create a suitable floor plan to service the use as a residential property.

Residential Amenity

The proposals suggest no risk to residential amenity, the proposals suggest no amendment to any first floor elements of the property apart from the addition of a rearward roof light, meaning that the proposals do not suggest any risk of overlooking to any of the adjacent properties. Additionally, both extensions to the property are only single-storey in nature and therefore cannot be considered to present an overshadowing or overlooking risk.

Conclusion

For the reasons listed above it is determined that this application is in compliance 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. 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.