DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H09-0738-22**	**Applicant:**	**E Portor**
Proposal:	Render of front and rear elevations		
Location:	17 Albert Street Holbeach Spalding		
Terminal Date:	12th October 2022		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
29	The Historic Environment

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
PARISH COUNCIL	0	0	0	0
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	1
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

PROPOSAL

This is a householder application seeking permission to render the front and rear elevations in a K-rend in buttermilk with a polar white or champagne colour finish.

The application originally included replacement of the front door with a upvc door, however, this was not supported by the Conservation Officer therefore it has been removed from the proposal.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is located on Albert Street in Holbeach. The site is located within the Holbeach Conservation area. It comprises a mid-terrace. The dwelling has a faux-stone finish with a red timber front door. The immediate street comprises dwellings with a mixture of render and brick finish.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

REPRESENTATIONS

Cllr F Biggadike

Supports the Conservation Officer comments.

Conservation Officer

No objections to the proposal to render the property, as the removal of the current faux stone cladding would be a positive change to the visual qualities of the property. The upvc door is not supported therefore it is recommended this is removed from the application.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Layout, Design, Size and Scale

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2021 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 proposal relates solely to the visual appearance of the building and therefore the key consideration in this instance is the impact the proposed render would have on the character and appearance of the building and wider conservation area.

The proposal to render the property with a polar white or champagne colour finish is considered acceptable given there is evidence of render in the immediate area.

In addition, the Councils Conservation Officer has not objected to this and considers the removal of the current faux stone cladding to be a positive change to the visual qualities of the property as several other similar properties in this portion of the Conservation Area, including the adjoining property, make use of off-white render.

The Conservation Officer however, objected to the proposal to replace the front door with upvc as the use of upvc has not become the predominant form for front doors in this portion of the conservation area, and therefore, to permit, via planning consent, would be to introduce an inappropriate form and material into this portion of the conservation area. As such this element has been removed from the proposal.

As such the proposed development would comply with the aforementioned policies on design and impact upon the character of the local area and would preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Planning Balance

The proposal will not materially harm the character or appearance of the locality. The planning balance is therefore considered to be in favour of the proposal.

CONCLUSION

In light of the considerations above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2, 3 and 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) and Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

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.

RECOMMENDATION

The application can be approved under delegated powers.