DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H18-0171-20**	**Applicant:**	**S E King Building Contractors Ltd**
Proposal:	Details of Conditions 4 (extent of structural works), 5 (boundary treatment details), 6 (landscaping), 7 (details of brickwork), 8 (details of roofing materials), 9 (door frame details), 10 (window frame details), 12 (details of rooflights) & 21 (details of private roadway construction/surfacing) of application H18-1299-16		
Location:	Estate Office Bridge Farm New Road Sutton Bridge		
Terminal Date:	13th May 2020		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
23	The Reuse of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use
29	The Historic Environment

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Sections 5, 12 and 16

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
RESIDENTS	1	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This application is to discharge conditions 4 (extent of structural works), 5 (boundary treatment details), 6 (landscaping), 7 (details of brickwork), 8 (details of roofing materials), 9 (door frame details), 10 (window frame details), 12 (details of rooflights) & 21 (details of private roadway

construction/surfacing) of application H18-1299-16.

Site Description

The site is located in open countryside on the eastern side of New Road. It is currently occupied by a range of agricultural barns. A pair of semi-detached houses (nos 194 and 196) are situated to the north-east, set back off a private roadway, and a house (No. 192) to the south-west.

Planning History

H18-1299-16 - Full - Conversion of barns into three dwellings - Granted 15 May 2017.

H18-0137-20 - C/C - Details relating to contamination and archaeology (Conditions 16 and 17 of H18-1299-16) - Approved 18 March 2020

Consultation Responses

LCC Highways/SUDS - Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.

Public - Resident objection received relating to overlooking/invasion of privacy and blockage of natural light.

Planning Considerations

Condition 4 (extent of structural works) - The submitted plans indicate that the roof structure will remain and be repaired where necessary. The existing first floor structure is to be retained and repaired where necessary. The proposed extent of physical works to be carried out is acceptable.

Condition 5 (boundary treatment details) - Boundary treatment includes new Lincolnshire post and rail fencing and also mixed hedging. The scheme is considered acceptable and would not materially harm the amenity of neighbouring residents in terms of overlooking, lack of privacy, etc.

Condition 6 (landscaping) - Tree and mixed hedge planting are proposed at the rear.

Condition 7 (details of brickwork) - The proposed new brickwork is York Handmade Bricks Old Clamp Blend

Condition 8 (details of roofing materials) - Existing pantiles will be re-laid and missing or broken slates will be replaced where possible. New roofs to have either reclaimed slate or reclaimed pantiles. The proposed materials are acceptable.

Condition 9 (door frame details) - Vertical timber boarded doors and gates would be utilised. The submitted door frame/glazed screen details are satisfactory.

Condition 10 (window frame details) - The windows would be flush with side opening lights the submitted details are considered to be satisfactory.

Condition 12 (details of rooflights) - Conservation roof lights are proposed. The submitted details are considered to be acceptable.

Condition 21 (details of private roadway construction/surfacing) - The entrance will be constructed in paviors and the remainder in gravel. LCC Highways does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.

Note: Concerns have been raised by a local resident on grounds of overlooking/invasion of privacy and blockage of natural light. However, such matters have already been assessed as part of the original planning application (ref. H18-1299-16) and do not form part of this condition compliance application, which relates solely to the details.

Conclusion

That conditions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12 and 21 of H18-1299-16 be discharged.

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.