

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H18-0671-19 **Applicant:** Mr D Bunn
Proposal: Extension and alterations of existing house. Existing outbuilding to be converted into annexe and buildings linked together with a link building
Location: 36 Petts Lane Sutton Bridge Spalding
Terminal Date: 1st December 2019

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
04	Approach to Flood Risk
29	The Historic Environment

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 12. Achieving well-designed places
 Section 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 Section 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
IAN MARSHMAN, HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OFFICER	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application that seeks permission for extension and alterations of existing house and conversion of outbuilding into annexe linked together with the house at 36 Petts Lane, Sutton Bridge, Spalding.

The set of house and outbuildings is a well-preserved inter-war former farmstead small holding built by the Ministry of Agriculture in the 1920s as part of the Crown Colony at Sutton Bridge on the former Guys Hospital Estate. This farm colony was designed by the Government to provide returning serviceman with a place to settle and make a living from the land following the end of the First World War.

No building within the curtilage is currently protected under Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended)

The original proposal has been amended in light of the heritage officers' concerns. The reason of the objection was that the proposal as it stood did would mean that the historic character would no longer be legible, leading to an almost total loss of historic significance.

Site Description

The site is approximately 600 metres due north-east of the built-up area of Sutton Bridge. Petts Lane serves access between New Road to the west and the embankment of the River Nene to the east.

The area is predominantly rural. No. 178 New Road is the nearest property to the application site within a 100 metre distance. Further properties are located down the lane.

The site is surrounded by open fields. A more than 2 metre high mature conifer hedge has been observed on the northern-west and rear boundaries. A domestic garden laid in lawn is bounded by the aforementioned hedgerow. Three mature trees stand on the edge of the highway.

Most of the land falls below the levels of the countryside lane. The site access therefore has a slope that leads to the driveway with turning point to the front of the house. The dwelling is a two-storey high pitched bungalow with a modern extension to the front/northern-west side elevation. On the other side of the driveway there is the old barn subject to conversion into an annexe. One small scale barn immediately adjacent to the site access and one further to the side of the outbuilding are the remaining structures within the curtilage.

History

None.

Consultation Responses

Sutton Bridge Parish Council

No objection.

County Historic Environment Officer

No objection.

SHDC Conservation Officer

No objection.

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site is out of the settlement boundaries of Sutton Bridge as set out in the South East

Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. The site therefore is within an area designated as countryside. However, there is no objection to the principle of development for an extension which is intrinsically of subservient use to the dwelling and cannot be located elsewhere. The key policy issues therefore relate to other materials considerations listed below.

Design and layout

This is a paramount consideration of the proposal on the planning assessment. Whilst many of the former crown colony farmsteads have been lost or heavily altered in the recent past, the former small holding on the application site is well-preserved and retains much of its historic and architectural significance. Moreover, the former farmsteads are semi-detached whereas this one is detached providing further uniqueness to the development. No structure on the site is a listed building although the development is clearly a non-designated heritage asset in light of the mentioned above.

According to Paragraph 197 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019 "in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset".

The proposal entails the erection of a two-storey gable pitched extension between the house and the barn. It would be connected with the main property by a glass and aluminium link. The height would be as much as that of the house and less than one metre higher than the barn pitch. The extension would be slightly set forward from the front building line and most of the mass would extend backwards. There would be sufficient separation distance with the barn. For these reasons, it is concluded that the extension would not appear to be cramped within the site and would be subservient to the main property in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

The barn has an ill-designed extension to the rear which would be replaced for a deeper extension keeping the catslide roof layout. Similar alterations would be also proposed in the house. There is an existing front/side extension poorly designed which would be removed.

Internally, the extension would accommodate three bedrooms on the first floor level and combined kitchen/dining and lounge room on the ground floor level. The barn would host self-contained accommodation comprising one ensuite bedroom in the loft space and a combined kitchen/dining and lounge room on the ground floor level.

The external walls of the house would be rendered with a smooth cream coloured finish and those of the barn would be coated with black timber boarding. The new roof tiles would match as closely as possible to those existing in the house. New fenestration and doors would be made of dark grey UPVC or aluminium.

On balance, the resulting appearance would not represent a loss of the original fabric of the buildings and respect the rural character of the heritage asset and its setting. In addition to that, the proposal would also allow the enhancement of the original structures such the removal of subsequent rear extension of the barn with old metal sheeting and decaying cement render of the barn walls.

Impact upon residential amenity

The position of the extension between the house and the barn is such that it would not create any overbearing effect to the residents of the property. Having confirmed that the extensions would be subservient to the host building, it is not anticipated any overbearing impact on the residents. Given the location within the sun path and scale of the new development, no overshadowing would be casted between buildings insofar as the amenity standards of the residents would result undermined.

There is no residential property immediately adjacent to the site.

Highway safety and car parking provision

The erection of the house annexe would notably reduce the existing parking space between the main property and the barn. Notwithstanding this, the remainder of the drive would be sufficiently spacious to accommodate 3 no. car parking spaces which is the minimum required for houses of 4

or more bedrooms according to Appendix 6: Parking Standards of SELLP, 2019 in conjunction with Policy 36.

The cars could egress the site in a safe and forward manner after carrying out the proposal. Thus, the development would not create any "unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network". Otherwise refusal could have been warranted as per Paragraph 109 of NPPF, 2019.

Flood risk and drainage

The site lies on the 'Danger for All' area with flood depths predicted greater than 2 metres from ground level according to South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (March 2017). The proposal is householder development and as such no sequential test should be applied as per Paragraph 164 of NPPF. In any case, a flood mitigation approach has been used when designing the proposal and the bedrooms would be located on the first floor level as an escape point from severe flooding events.

No surface flooding has been anticipated on the site. The management strategy for surface water runoff can be designed and approved at a later stage with SHDC Building Control.

Conclusion

Taking into consideration the mentioned above, the proposal is in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 29 and 36 of South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 and Sections 12, 14 and 16 of National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

It is accordingly recommended to approve this planning application via delegated decision.

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.