DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H13-0988-21**	**Applicant:**	**D Brown Builders Contractors Ltd.**
Proposal:	Proposed store building extension and re-clad of existing building - approved under H13-1061-18. Amendments to include external brickwork wall to be added to proposed store extension & high level cladding to existing store building.		
Location:	D Brown Building Contractors Ltd Seas End Road Moulton Seas End		
Terminal Date:	21st October 2021		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019
National Guidance **National Planning Policy Framework 2021**

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

Full planning permission has been granted for a proposed store building extension and re-clad of an existing building (ref. H13-1061-18).

This application is to amend the external materials. The lower section of the extension would be external brickwork to match the front of the existing store and the upper section of the latter would be high level cladding (Goosewing Grey) to match the extension.

Site Description

The buildings are located on the western side of Seas End Road and form part of a builders yard. They are currently used as business units.

A converted barn is situated to the north (Waites Farm Barns) and a house (West View) opposite. Chestnut Farm is situated further to the south-east on the opposite side of Seas End Road.

Planning History

H13-0178-16 - Full - Proposed store building extension and re-clad of existing building - Granted 18 April 2016.

H13-0096-18 - S73 - Proposed store building extension and re-clad of existing building - approved under H13-0178-16 - modification to wording of Condition 3 - Granted 21 March 2018.

H13-1061-18 - Full - Change of use of 5 existing storage units to Class B1 (Business) plus erection of additional business unit (Class B1) - Granted 11 December 2018.

Planning Considerations

Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (introduced by S190 of the Planning Act, 2008) makes it possible to apply for a non-material amendment to existing planning permissions.

The Council has therefore introduced a system whereby 'minor amendments' to a scheme can be considered as a way of allowing the planning system to respond in a reasonable and flexible manner to small changes to an approved scheme without seeking a fresh application.

South Holland District Council's "Development Control Procedure Note: Non-Material Amendments to Planning Permissions" indicates that non material amendments will be approved subject to the following criteria being met:

1. There would be no alteration to the application site boundary (red edge).
2. The amendment would not conflict with Development Plan Policies or other Government Guidance.
3. The proposal would not exacerbate concerns raised by third parties at original planning application stage.
4. The proposed change would not be contrary to a condition on the original approval.
5. The approved footprint/siting of the building will not be moved materially and will not have a material impact on a neighbour.
6. The height of the building or extension would not be increased.
7. The amendment would not result in any potential overlooking of any neighbouring property.
8. The amendments must not result in a fundamental change in the design of the building.
9. The proposal does not amount to new works or elements not considered by any Environmental Statement submitted with the application.

The criteria set out above are designed to prevent amendments being accepted that would have a detrimental impact upon neighbours or amenity in the wider public interest.

Assessing the proposal against the above:

1. No alterations are proposed to the site boundary;
2. The proposed alterations are minor and would not conflict with the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019;
3. No concerns were raised by third parties relating to the external appearance of the buildings;
4. No specific conditions were imposed relating to external appearance;
5. No building would be moved;
6. The height would not be increased;
7. No potential overlooking issues would arise as a result of the amendment;
8. The alterations wouldn't fundamentally alter the design of the development and would match that existing to a greater degree;
9. No Environmental Statement was submitted.

Conclusion

The proposal satisfactorily complies with the criteria of the South Holland District Council's "Development Control Procedure Note: Non-Material Amendments to Planning Permissions", and as such is acceptable as a Non-Material Amendment.

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.