

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H18-1182-19 **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs S Farley
Proposal: Proposed extension and alterations
Location: 92 Peters Point Road Sutton Bridge Spalding
Terminal Date: 16th March 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
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

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	1	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder planning application that seeks permission for proposed extensions and alterations to the property at 92 Peters Point Road, Sutton Bridge.

The proposed works entails the following:

- Replacement of existing lean-to element on the eastern side elevation for side-rear extension.
- Erection of front/rear extension on the western side elevation.

Most of the alterations are internal and refers to wall demolition, brick up openings and erection of new walls in order to reconfigure the internal layout and serve access between the existing building and the proposed extensions.

The house 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. The property does not benefit from any heritage protection but it will be considered non-designated heritage asset in view of its historical significance.

Site Description

The area is clearly countryside with open agricultural fields extending to all directions. The site is a small agricultural holding within a sizeable curtilage. In addition to the residential property, there is an L shaped old barn, large high timber barn, timber shed and kennels. The remainder of the land is laid in grass and the drive in gravel. Laurel mature hedges are along the front boundary whereas post and rail fencing and shrubs are on both sides of the curtilage.

History

H18-0383-11 - Proposed two-storey extension - Approved

H18-0769-04 - Two-storey extension to front of property - Approved

Consultation Responses

Sutton Bridge Parish Council

Support.

County Historic Environment Officer

No objections.

Planning Considerations

Principle of development

The site lies on land designated as countryside as set out in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019. There is no objection to the principle of extensions and associated alterations to a residential property. By reason of nature, the development cannot be located elsewhere more sustainable following the settlement hierarchy in Policy 1. The key policy issues of this proposal therefore relate to the material considerations mentioned below.

Layout and design

Paragraph 127 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, among other considerations. Design which is inappropriate to the local area, or which fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area, will not be acceptable as per Policy 2 of the SELLP.

Given the historical interest of the host property, it is worth considering Paragraph 197 of NPPF, 2019 which states that a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of non-designated heritage assets.

The house is an old 1.5-storey farmstead with steep gable pitched roof. The above-mentioned extensions were approved but never carried out.

The proposed side/front western extension would form an inverted L shape building. The mass of the development would project approximately 2.40 metres to the front of the house and 12.40 metres to the rear. The width would be tantamount to the original house. The development would contain several gable roof pitches which vary in height. The main part of the extension would have a ridge height higher than the existing house. This is considered to be a feature which would not be detrimental to the design of the proposal or appearance of the house. The development in general would appear balanced.

The existing lean-to element on the western side elevation would be demolished and a rear/side extension is proposed as a replacement. The enlargement would be partially tantamount to the footprint of the lean-to and extend additionally 1.50 metres to the rear and 3.60 metres along the rear wall. The pitch height would be replicated as the existing gable. Furthermore, in view of the sizeable site and distance with neighbouring structures, the development would sit well within the curtilage. For these reasons, it is concluded that the proposed extension would be acceptable in terms of scale, mass and height and would also constitute an appropriate form of development in relation to both the host property and the site.

The detailing of the proposed extensions would respect the historic appearance of the former farm house following the comments made by County Historic Environment Officer. The traditional timber door and slit window adjacent to it will remain. Likewise, the weatherboarding on the front dormer window should be retained.

The proposed plans indicate a mixture of facing brickwork and render and some presence of timber cladding. The general approach of the intended material schedule is to balance the traditional rural character of the cottage and contemporary appearance of new elements. Awaiting further details of the external materials, this is considered in principle to be well delivered without being at expense of undermining the historical significance of the asset.

In view of the above, the design and layout of the development would respect the scale, height, appearance and historical significance of the house. The proposals would not be at odds with the rural setting of the surroundings. Overall, the intended development comply with the aforementioned policies.

Residential amenity

There is a separation distance of approximately 35 metres with No. 91 to the east and 195 metres with Heather Cottage (No. 93) to the west.

At such distances, the extensions would create no harmful impact upon the amenity standards of the occupiers of the nearest dwellinghouses. Neither overlooking nor overbearing nor overshadowing could occur. Therefore, the development complies with residential amenity which is one of the key principles of design and development management as set out in Policies 2 and 3 of SELLP (2019).

Car parking provision

Appendix 6 of SELLP sets out minimum requirements for parking provision. 3 no. spaces for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms are at least required for new housing development. The dwelling would have 4 bedrooms should the proposed works be carried out.

The proposed site layout shows 3 no. car park spaces to the front of the property. However, the driveway is spacious and also slightly extends to the eastern side elevation so that there would be room for the forth parking space. Thus, the proposal would ensure minimum car parking provision for the occupiers of the house as set out in the Local Plan.

Conclusion

Taking into account the considerations above, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies 1, 2, 3 and 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP), 2019 and Appendix 6, as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019.

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

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.