DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H02-0296-25**	**Applicant:**	**Mr & Mrs P Harrison**
Proposal:	Proposed Open Fronted Garage		
Location:	21 The Chase Crowland Peterborough		
Terminal Date:	21st May 2025		

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
28	The Natural Environment
36	Vehicle and Cycle Parking
APPENDIX 6	Parking Standards

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 4 - Decision-making
Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 11 - Making effective use of land
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

National Guidance

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	1
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
NORTH LEVEL INTERNAL DRAINAGE	0	0	0	1

BOARD				

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks full planning permission an open fronted detached garage on land at 21 The Chase, Crowland. The garage is proposed to be located 3m in front of the dwelling within the site. The garage is proposed to measure 5.5m by 5.9m, with a gable end roof form that would measure 4m up to its ridgeline. The garage is proposed to be clad in timber.

Site Description

The site comprises land at 21 The Case, Crowland. The site features a detached single storey bungalow which features rendered facades. The site is located within the settlement limit of Crowland, as identified by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, and the accompanying policies map.

Relevant Planning History

H02-0160-91: (Full Application) Extension to dwelling - approved 25 April 1991

H02-0998-04: (Full Application) New pitched roof and alterations to form double garage - approved 27 August 2004

H02-0547-06: (Outline Application) Residential development - demolish existing dwelling and proposed 5 dwellings - refused 21 June 2006

H02-1741-06: (Full Application) Conversion of detached bungalow into pair of semi-detached bungalows - approved 13 February 2007

H02-0135-13: (Full Application) Single-storey extension to bungalow - approved 02 April 2013

H02-0168-15: (Full Application) Proposed extensions to front and rear of property - approved 05 May 2015

H02-0448-15: (Full Application) Erect detached garage - refused 23 June 2015 - appeal dismissed 28 October 2015

H02-0404-16: (Full Application) Proposed porch - approved 13 June 2016

H02-0855-24: (Full Application) Proposed Garden Room/Conservatory - approved 23 December 2024

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the consultation period are summarised below. The responses can be viewed in their entirety on South Holland District Council's website.

Crowland Parish Council: No comments.

Lincolnshire County Council - Highways and SUDS: No objections. There is sufficient space on site to accommodate this inclusive of further parking a space to turn. The proposal will not have an adverse effect on the public highway.

Cllr B Alcock: No response received.

Cllr J Astill: No response received.

Cllr A Harrison: No response received.

Public Representations

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, no letters of representation have been received.

Key Planning Considerations

Development Plan

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, December 2024 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

There are no adopted Neighbourhood Plans for the area within which the site is located.

The main issues and considerations in this case include the following:

-Principle of Development;
-Design and Visual Impact; and
-Impact on Amenity.

These matters are assessed in turn below.

Principle of Development

Policy 1 of the Local Plan sets out the settlement hierarchy in respect of delivering sustainable development, which meets the social and economic needs of the area whilst protecting and enhancing the environment; in order to provide enough choice of land for housing to satisfy local need, whilst making more sustainable use of land, and to minimise the loss of high-quality agricultural plots by developing in sustainable locations and at appropriate densities.

Policy 1 expresses this sustainable hierarchy of settlements, ranking the settlements deemed to be most sustainable in descending order. The most sustainable locations for development are situated within the 'Sub-Regional Centres', followed by 'Main Service Centres'. Lower down the hierarchy are areas of limited development opportunity including Minor Service Centres, with areas of development constraint comprising 'Other Service Centres and Settlements'. The countryside is at the bottom of the settlement hierarchy and represents the least sustainable location.

The site is within the defined settlement of Crowland which is a Main Service Centre. Policy 1 sets out that development in this type of settlement will be permitted that supports their role as a service centre for the settlement itself, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities. In this case, the proposal solely relates to the erection of a detached garage building. Therefore, the principle of such development is appropriate. This is however provided that the design of the garage is suitable in terms of its visual and amenity impact.

Design and Visual Impact

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

Policy 2 of the Local Plan outlines sustainable development considerations for development proposals, providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals.

Policy 3 accords with the provisions of Section 12 of the NPPF, in that it requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically-designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

The dwelling within the site is a single storey bungalow that spans most of the width of the site. The dwelling features a gable end roof form, and the front porch area features a hipped roof form. The site is within a predominantly residential area, and The Chase is characterised mainly by single storey dwellings of varying sizes and designs.

The garage is proposed to be located within the front garden / driveway area of the dwelling. The garage is proposed to be set back from the front boundary of the site by approximately 2.5m and from the shared side boundary with 23 The Chase by approximately 2m. The front garden and driveway area is enclosed along the site frontage with a timber fence and there are stone walls on either side of the vehicular access.

The garage is proposed to measure 5.5m by 5.9m. A gable end roof form is proposed, measuring 4m in height from the ground level up to the ridgeline. The eaves at the front of the structure would measure 2.2m in height from the ground level, and the eaves on the rear of the garage would measure 1.7m in height. The rear and side elevations are proposed to be covered with timber and the front elevation is proposed to be left open.

The nearest dwellings are set back from the road frontage at a similar distance and there are no other garages or outbuildings located in front of the nearest dwellings on The Chase. The proposed structure would be highly visible in the street scene, and it is considered that the garage would be out of keeping with the surrounding area. The proposed structure would be an unduly prominent and incongruous feature in the street scene due to its position in front of the dwelling and its proximity to the highway. The negative visual impact would be further exacerbated by the absence of other buildings in front gardens in the vicinity of the site.

An application for a similar detached garage in front of the dwelling was previously refused under application H02-0448-15 on 23 June 2015. An appeal was submitted and subsequently dismissed as the inspector agreed that the garage would be an unduly prominent and incongruous feature in the street scene (Paragraph 6) (PINS Ref: 3129022). Although this application and appeal were determined prior to the adoption of the current Local Plan, the decisions still form a material consideration in the determination of the current application. The current proposals share similarities with the previously refused garage and it is considered that the proposal remains unsuitable.

The visual impact of the proposed development is therefore unacceptable. The proposed development would cause an adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area and would therefore not accord with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that development should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Policies 2 and 3 of Local Plan set out that residential amenity and the relationship to existing development and land uses is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

Due to the scale and positioning of the garage, the garage would not result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing of neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the garage building would not comprise a habitable building. As such, the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact in terms of overlooking. Therefore, the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of neighbouring properties and future occupants would be acceptable. As such, the proposed development accords with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Other Matters

Lincolnshire County Council's highways team have set out that the proposal is not expected to have an adverse impact on the public highway. As such. The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of highway safety.

The site is located within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3. The southern parts of the site are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The area where the garage is proposed is within Flood Zone 1. The site is located within a low hazard rating area, as ¬identified by the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The proposal does not seek consent for any additional floorspace for habitable rooms. Therefore, no specific flood risk mitigation is required in this instance.

Planning Balance

As detailed above, Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended, requires that the Local Planning Authority makes decisions in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposed garage building would be an incongruent and harmful feature within the street scene. There are no similar garages or outbuildings in front of the nearest dwellings and the proposed garage would result in a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. In this instance, there are material considerations that weigh against the proposal and as such, the planning balance is in favour of refusal in this instance.

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.

Conclusion

Taking the above considerations into account, the proposal would conflict with Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan and section 12 of the NPPF.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be refused under delegated authority.