

DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No: H09-0367-21 **Applicant:** Mrs M Green
Proposal: Proposed car port to front of dwelling
Location: Commonfield Cottage 37 Little Common Lane Holbeach Clough
Terminal Date: 1st June 2021

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02 Development Management
03 Design of New Development

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Section 12- Achieving well designed places

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

This is a householder application seeking permission for a proposed car port to the front of the dwelling at Commonfield Cottage, 37 Little Common Lane, Holbeach Clough.

Site Description

The site is situated within the countryside according to the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The property is a detached dwelling located on the western side of Little Common Lane, which is effectively a cul-de-sac. The dwelling is set back from the road, with a large gravel driveway to the front which occupies the entire frontage. The boundary treatment includes a 1m high metal railing with gates along the eastern boundary.

History

H09-0484-05- FULL- Two-storey extension and alterations to dwelling- Approved 17-05-05.

Consultation Responses

No consultation responses received.

Planning Considerations

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2019 establishes that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting; and 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, among other considerations. Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP states that 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.

The proposed car port will measure approx. 6m by 6m, with a maximum overall height of approx. 2.5m, and will be situated close to the front boundary. Having regard to the existing dimensions of the house and the size of the plot, the proposed car port is acceptable in terms of scale, mass and bulk.

Materials proposed include wooden horizontal slats, wooden posts and a felt roof. Such materials are typical for a car port structure. The timber used for the car port will not be painted but will be treated before construction, remaining the natural colour of the wood. In terms of character, car ports can be prominent features in a street scene, especially where they are sited forward of the front elevation of a dwelling, as is the case in this instance. However, given that the neighbouring property is also sited close to the road it is not considered that it would be obtrusive in the wider street scene.

Taking the above into account, the proposed car port is deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in terms of layout, design, size and scale.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

It is not considered that the proposal would have a material adverse impact in terms of being overbearing or creating an overshadowing or overlooking impact. It is a non-habitable structure, with a maximum height of approx. 2.5m, and the neighbouring property has no facing windows.

Taking the above into account, the proposed car port is deemed to comply with Policies 2 and 3 in the SELLP, 2019 and Section 12 in the NPPF, 2019 in terms of residential amenity.

Planning Balance

Section 38 (6) of the Town and Country Planning Act, as amended by the 2004 Act, states that the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposed car port will not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality or amenity of nearby residents. It is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.

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

The recommendation is for a delegated approval.