DECISION DELEGATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

Application No:	**H18-0338-21**	**Applicant:**	**CP Media**
Proposal:	Install and display 4 non-illuminated roundabout sponsorship signs		
Location:	A17 Roundabout Sutton Bridge Spalding		
Terminal Date:	25th May 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

NPPF: Section 12

PPG (Advertisements)

Representations:

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

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Proposal

The application seeks advertisement consent for 4no non-illuminated signs to be located on the roundabout. The signs would measure 1200mm (width) x 500mm (height), fixed into the ground using steel posts with the posts standing 350mm above the ground.

Site Description

The application site comprises a roundabout located on the A17 in Sutton Bridge. The site is outside any defined settlement boundary and in the open countryside. The immediate area is characterised by a mixture of open countryside, residential and commercial properties.

History

No relevant planning history.

Consultation Responses

Sutton Bridge Parish Council
The Parish Council objects to the scheme on grounds that the proposed signage will be a dangerous distraction to motorists.

Lincolnshire County Council Local Highways Authority
No objection to the scheme as it does not consider the proposed advertisements to result in any unacceptable impact upon highway safety.

Planning Considerations

Impact on amenity

The proposed signage is considered to be minor in appearance given their size. The number of signs can be accepted given they would sit on a big roundabout and would be sufficiently spaced out and would not result in a cluttered street appearance. As such the size and number of signs is considered appropriate for the site.

The proposal therefore accords with Policies 2 and 3 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019.

Highway/Public Safety

Sutton Bridge Parish Council has raised objections on grounds of highway safety. The concerns are noted, however, the signs would be non-illuminated and given their relatively low height and modest size they are not considered to result in any highway safety issues. In addition, Lincolnshire County Council Local Highways Authority has not raised any objection to the scheme as it does not consider the proposed advertisements to result in any unacceptable impact upon highway safety.

As such the proposal accords with Policy 2 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 in terms of highway safety.

Planning Balance

The proposed signage is acceptable on amenity and highway/public safety grounds. There are no issues that outweigh factors in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

In light of the above considerations the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019 and Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

A delegated approval is considered to be appropriate.

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.

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.