DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H18-0135-23**	**Applicant:**	**Mrs A Farley**
Proposal:	Details of cladding and render - (Condition 3 of H18-0758-22)		
Location:	Fenacre Farm 92 Peters Point Road Sutton Bridge		
Terminal Date:	6th April 2023		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Section 12. Achieving well-designed places

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks discharge of condition 3 (materials schedule) of application H18-0758-22.

Site Description

As original application.

History

H18-0758-22 - Side and rear extension, internal alterations and rendering of existing dwelling - Approved

H18-1182-19 - Proposed extension and alterations - Approved

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

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

Consultation Responses

No representations received.

Planning Considerations

Condition 3 - Materials Schedule

The following materials are proposed:

Walls - red traditional brick & stone audley antique bricks and K-Rend (scraped texture) in Champagne or similar colour finish
Doors/windows - Aluminium in RAL 7038 Agate grey colour finish
Gutters/downpipes - Black aluminium
Roof tiles - Sandtoft 20/20 Interlocking clay roof tile in flanders colour finish

These materials are considered acceptable therefore condition 3 of application H18-0758-22 can be discharged.

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 into account, it is considered that Condition 3 of H18-0758-22 can be discharged.